



3 1761 02086227 2



THE LIBRARY
of
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
Toronto

TORCHBEARERS

OF

CHRISTENDOM

THE LIGHT THEY SHED AND
THE SHADOWS THEY CAST

BY

Robert Remington Doherty

“Still the race of hero spirits

Pass the torch from hand to hand”

C. Kingsley

TORONTO

WILLIAM BRIGGS

WESLEY BUILDINGS

MONTREAL: C. W. COATES

HALIFAX: S. F. HUESTIS

1896

BR
150
D63

EMMANUEL

Copyright by
EATON & MAINS,
1896.

175861

EATON & MAINS PRESS,
150 Fifth Avenue, New York.

A Word to Begin With

THIS book has been written for young people, and for older folks who love the Church but do not know much about it. It is an attempt to construct an historic framework which shall be at once simple and attractive. The scholarly reader will, I trust, see signs of painstaking effort for accuracy. But my prime endeavor has been to make the course of events in Christendom easily understandable, and so entertaining that an abiding taste for Church history may be begotten in many.

I have always admired the grace of the Frenchman who said of his book, "Mine is the string on which these pearls are strung." But while threading my borrowed pearls I have found that even my string is partly spliced out with others' choice ravelings. To Dr. Matheson's masterly essay on *The Originality of Christ* I am largely indebted for the presentation of our Lord's ideal of life. In recording Paul's career I

A Word to Begin With

have done little more than to recast Dr. Plumptre's analysis; and Dr. W. F. Slater and Dr. Henry Cowan, and other living masters, have been closely followed in places. Indeed, as I lay down my pen, I am half disposed to say that if there is anything original in this book I am hardly to blame, so earnestly have I coveted every grouping of facts which seemed to be specially adapted to impress my readers. Nevertheless, the book has individual features, and I trust will be found to have a mission of its own.

Let me urge Epworth Leaguers to familiarize themselves with the great histories of the Church. Nowhere else are lessons so salutary to be found concerning God and man; and, with all sacred literature within reach, the young Methodist should have especial pride and enthusiasm in following the lead of such eminent scholars as Bishop Hurst, Dr. Slater, and Dr. Dryer.

ROBERT R. DOHERTY.

Contents

Jesus the Light of the World.	PAGE
I. The Light of the World.....	9
II. A Row of Pegs to Hang Historic Facts on...	25
 Paul, and the Primitive Church.	
I. The Age of the Apostles.....	37
II. The Story of Paul.....	50
III. A Life and Death Struggle.....	68
 Constantine : the Church Controlled by the State.	
I. The Story of Constantine.....	91
II. Fightings Without and Fears Within.....	108
III. Benedict and the Early Monks.....	116
 Gregory the Great, and the Early Middle Ages.	
I. The Story of Gregory the Great.....	123
II. The Story of Mohammed.....	133
III. Boniface, and the Mediæval Missionaries....	138
IV. Charlemagne, and the Holy Roman Empire.	141
V. The Separation of the Eastern and Western Churches.....	151
VI. A Thousand Years After Christ.....	157

Contents

Hildebrand : the State Controlled by the Church. PAGE

I. Hildebrand.....	163
II. The Story of the Crusades.....	178
III. The Beggar Monks, and the Grandfathers of Science.....	193
IV. The Babylonish Captivity, and the Morning Star of the Reformation.....	200

Martin Luther, and the Reformation.

I. The Story of Martin Luther.....	209
II. The Seventeenth Century.....	236

John Wesley, and the Modern Evangelical Church.

I. The Story of John Wesley.....	243
II. The March of Methodism.....	253
III. Low Church, High Church, and Broad Church.	255
IV. Dissenters.....	266
V. In the Land of Luther.....	268
VI. The Reformed Churches.....	271
VII. The Eastern Churches.....	272
VIII. The Roman Catholic Church.....	276
IX. A Very Miscellaneous Chapter.....	286

•

Jesus
the Light of the World

•

“In Him was life ; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness ; and the darkness comprehended it not. . . . That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.”—JOHN THE EVANGELIST.

Torchbearers of Christendom

I

The Light of the World

JESUS OF NAZARETH IS THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD. He so declared himself to be, and he has been so proclaimed through the centuries by his followers. We use the same figure whenever we talk of an enlightened community, or, in more colloquial phrase, of a "bright" student; but those who study the life of Jesus never think of him as being "enlightened" or "bright," but as being THE LIGHT—the Source of all luminous morals and all virtuous energy.

Sometimes Christians have fallen to quarreling with each other about alleged discrepancies in the Gospel narratives, about the genuineness of certain texts, about the method and degree of inspiration, and other such matters. They forget that such flaws, even if unmistakably discovered, would be mere scratches on the glass through which THE

Jesus the Light

LIGHT shines. It is not the lantern that guides and saves men; it is THE LIGHT.

Outside of Christendom many teachers of the truth of God have lived—some of them long before our Lord's birth, Gautama, for example, and Socrates and Confucius, and some after his death, as Mohammed; but what these taught bore much the resemblance to what he taught that the violet or orange ray bears to the pure white light—it is brilliant and beautiful, but “colored,” partial, and therefore misleading. The great good men of Christendom, the expounders and exemplifiers of our Lord's doctrine, have lighted their torches at this central Flame. They have been light-bearers. Jesus is the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. On this truth the meaning and importance of all Church history depend.

And just as the history of Christendom derives its meaning from the divine character and mission of its Author, so he himself becomes intelligible to us in proportion as we regard him as the prophesied Messiah, the perfect Flower of which the Mosaic system was the bud. The four evangelists and the five or six epistle writers lose no oppor-

Jesus the Light

tunity to show that the Gospel of Christ is the fulfillment of the law of Moses. That law announced in plain words the first principles of right action for man in all his relations to God and to his fellow-men. Added to these were many restrictions and promises given in the language of prescribed rites; so that almost every act of Jewish life became an acted parable; and the killing of lambs, the tinkling of bells, the burning of incense, the embroidery of garments, the muzzling of oxen, the fencing of roofs, and a thousand other daily incidents were made typical; that is, they were used to teach deeper truths than those which appeared on the surface, and those truths all had to do with the Coming One. The great national aim was "to receive and conserve divine revelations until they should be all fulfilled in the coming of the Messiah." So that Israel became in a true sense a priest nation for mankind.

The fact that Jesus fulfilled prophecy should not shut our eyes to the more important fact that he introduced into the world an absolutely new Ideal. He was no more like Moses than he was like the heroes of heathendom. Think much on this, for it

Jesus the Light

helps to show how he was the underived Light.

When in all ages men have tried to become great and godlike their gods have been simply their own ideals personified. There have been gods many and lords many; that is, the forces worshiped have had many names; but the ideals themselves, however they were named, were never more in number than four or five. There is no sign of striving after the highest that does not reach out toward one or other of four or five ideals. But the portrait of Jesus Christ presents no analogy to any of these. It is strangely inharmonious with all.

Take the ideal of the Jew first. It has been made familiar to us by both Testaments. It was a profoundly religious ideal. But the Jew's religion was one of law and ceremony, of "doing things." Its earnestness was the earnestness of fanaticism. It honestly believed truth to be exclusively its own possession. It had no message for the world at large. But Jesus Christ, though a Jew by birth, calls out the sympathies and satisfies the heart hunger of all races. He is as near to the modern American and the Congo cannibal as to the earnest Phari-

Jesus the Light

see and the heartsick *roué* of ancient Rome. Whether Phillips Brooks or Sia Sek Ong, whether Paul or Francis Xavier, tells of his love to Christ, it is the same story.

Jesus introduced into the world a conception of spirituality which, just because it is the highest type of life, comprehends within itself all the lower forms of existence; which, because it is sacred, includes also the secular, and because it is high, stretches down to the minute and lowly. This thought was of all thoughts that most remote from the Jewish mind, and when the Jewish mind beheld it, it beheld it with aversion.

Here is a Nazarene who walks out from among his fellow-carpenters into the solitudes of the wilderness, to wrestle with Satan and to be ministered to by angels. His logical acuteness detects the subtleties of the Pharisee sophistry, while he himself remains a child through all his three and thirty years, and intuitively sees a citizen of God's pure kingdom in every other child. His vast outlook contemplates the nature of all things, while with minute particularity he dictates the precepts of the hour. With an all-absorbing desire for the spiritual

Jesus the Light

elevation of humanity, he surpasses all others in his detailed provision for the wants of man's body. His precepts are the strictest ever uttered, but he is boundlessly tolerant. He passes easily from sympathetic rejoicing with the joyful to sympathetic sorrowing with the sad. His life is a flame of purity, but he hastens to extend forgiveness to the impure. So far as Judaism is concerned, this is certainly a brand new ideal of character.

Turning to the heathen world, we find that the worship of Physical Strength, natural force, was its earliest ideal; and even to-day this worship prevails on the Asiatic continent. Man's spirit first reveres what he first recognizes—the power and force of nature. The individual sinks into insignificance in the contemplation of the outward universe, whose vast extent and changeless duration contrast so painfully with the frailty of human years. So the individual is taught that it is his religious duty to yield up his petty being to the abiding life of nature, to desire no life but its life, no immortality but that it enjoys.

So man's highest life became the loss of his personality. Unselfishness was taught,

Jesus the Light

it is true; but not because it was in itself noble, rather because individuality was in itself useless. Such views of man's nature led easily to admiration and worship of those human qualities which make one human being the lord over millions of his fellows. The man who wielded the greatest physical strength was the greatest man.

Jesus lived in direct and positive reversal of all this also. He lived a life that endured great things rather than a life that performed great things. His was a power to suffer even more than it was a power to work. His strength did not shine forth in outward majesty, but manifested itself rather in supporting outward meanness. In proportion as the human limitations cluster about the life of our Master, do we become more and more conscious of his essential majesty. We see his strength just where he is physically weakest, and behold his spiritual triumph precisely on that field where he is physically vanquished—the death of the cross. His ideal is to become individually great by living in the lives of others, to inherit the earth by meekness, to gain satisfaction by hunger and thirst of soul. A higher triumph awaits the peace-

Jesus the Light

maker than awaits the warmaker; the greatest conqueror is the forgiver; the most promising subjects of the new kingdom are the laboring and heavy laden, the consciously weak, and poor and needy. So, then, the standard of heroism in the gospels is precisely opposite to any reverence of physical strength of any sort. And we see that the conception of Christ was utterly foreign not only to Judea, but to early heathendom, and to the entire genius of the Asiatic intellect.

But we must not forget that there were many intellects in the heathen world who needed something loftier to worship than any mere embodiment of physical power. To them the pen seemed mightier than the sword; and man's mind was evidently made to rule physical nature. And so philosophers of all sects agreed in presenting for the reverence of the masses the ideal of Intellectual Power. According to them the world exists for the sake of an intellectual aristocracy, and the common herd are born to serve that aristocracy. Even Plato's intellectual man (perhaps the loftiest ideal ever conceived aside from inspiration) comes to the surface, not that he may carry down

Jesus the Light

into the depth a breath of the upper atmosphere, but that he may remain upon the surface and keep the depths forever beneath him. The philosopher has no room for the common emotions which animate mankind; he tries to despise material nature. The Platonist turns from the love of individual beings, and tries to fix his affections upon that which will not pass away. Platonic love was not the love of virtuous men, it was the love of the virtues of men; it was not the affection of noble hearts, it was the admiration of nobility. The soul beheld nothing but its own shadow, saw nothing but abstractions, pondered nothing but qualities, lived for nothing but the emancipation of individual desires.

But Jesus says, "I thank thee, O Father, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." He insists upon the simplicity, the spontaneousness, the absence of self-analysis, the unconsciousness of all power, and the ignorance of all merit which are the essential attributes of childhood. The heights to which a man arrives in the kingdom of heaven will be proportionate to his unconsciousness of worth. Self-

Jesus the Light

reliance was the highest of moral qualities in the pagan world; faith is the highest of moral qualities in the Christian world. To become a follower of the Master is to subside from self-reliance into absolute dependence, from the walk by sight to the walk by faith. It is to forget those points of intellectual superiority which may have separated a man from his brethren, and to lay hold of those points of human insufficiency which by a common sense of need links his intellectual life to the lives of all mankind. The ideal of Christianity was the death of the ideal of Greek and Roman philosophy.

Meantime, in the heart of the masses there had been growing up an ideal of a very different kind, an ideal which has been called that of Æsthetic Culture—using that phrase in its most limited sense, to indicate the perception of the beautiful in the forms of outward nature and the forms of the sensuous imagination. Philosophers might contemplate the abstract, but the masses delighted in visions of the beautiful. It was the beautiful in nature which to them revealed God. In the forms of nature they found the revelation of celestial harmonies,

Jesus the Light

and were kindled into a love of poetry which became to them the synonym for religion. When men come to recognize the beauty of nature they have ceased to fear nature, for the recognition of beauty is the sense of love, and love is incompatible with fear. Where the Brahman had beheld in the universe a gigantic strength before which he quailed, the Greek saw an insinuating charm which invited him to approach and tempted him to commune. His worship was untouched by terror; it was more like the worship of the poet than the adoration of the humble saint.

One need not argue that the conception of Christ's character did not harmonize with this. Christianity brought into the world a new estimate of the beautiful by the introduction of a new law of association. When Paul said that he gloried in the cross he expressed much more than the common faith of Christendom; he indicated the common assent of Christendom to the new association of the beautiful—the association of glory and pain. This to the heathen mind appeared the wildest of paradoxes.

But Christ was himself the personification of this new ideal. Majestic sweetness sits

Jesus the Light

enthroned upon a brow which was marred more than any man's. The Son of Man looks forward to the hour of deepest human frailty as the hour in which he shall be glorified. He declares on the road to Emmaus that the disharmony is an essential part of the beauty, for Christ must needs suffer that he might enter into his glory. He stands in the shadow of the cross, and bequeaths to the world his peace. He confronts the spectacle of death, and speaks of the fullness of joy. The cross and the crown, which are to-day grouped together in poetry, painting, and sculpture, stood in the ancient heathen mind at opposite poles—of ignominy and honor. It was Jesus who brought them together.

While Greece thus idealized the soft, the refined, the beautiful, Rome worshiped the strong, the stern, the fearful. That which she sought beyond all other things was to realize in actual life the power of humanity. The whole life of Rome was spent in an effort to raise an empire which should never be moved, and in whose eternity and immutability men might recognize the object of their religion. In this one particular there was a strange analogy between the other-

Jesus the Light

wise contrasted types of the Roman and the Jew. Both looked for the establishment of a sacred empire upon the basis of physical power, though the motive of the Jew was religious, the motive of the Roman worldly. Both contemplated the extension of that empire to the ends of the habitable world; and in a certain sense both were successful in their aim, though the Roman realized it literally, the Jew only metaphorically and in a way he did not desire. Both wrought out their design through the medium of outward conquest, though with the Roman the conquest was the end, with the Jew only the road to something higher. Thus united amid their differences, the Roman and the Jew have never been altogether separate through the whole course of history. When you read Part III of this little book you will find—in the outward legalism of mediæval worship; in the struggles of the papacy for dominion; above all, in that vast conception of a holy Roman empire which in a modified form dominates the European mind to-day—the influence of earlier ideals, and recognize in one united aim the theocratic theories of the Roman and the Jew.

But Jesus says, “ My kingdom is not of

Jesus the Light

this world." The Roman and the Jew strove for an empire which should be won by physical efforts and manifested by physical power; our Lord's kingdom is based not on laws and swords, but on the capacity for loving. Other kings shed the blood of their enemies; he shed his own. He conquered the heart of the world by exhibiting his own heart. This was contrary to all the conceptions of humanity before his day. Christ's domain had nothing in common with current ideals of regal majesty.

Our Lord's life, measured by the ordinary human standards, was a failure. He made few disciples, and his enemies killed him. It is only when we trace his life in the life of Christendom through succeeding ages that we begin to measure its triumph. What he refrained from doing when he was on earth is, as Bishop John P. Newman has eloquently shown, quite as remarkable as what he did. He reared no houses of mercy; he founded no orphan asylums. Cripples cried and widows wept, but those beneficent institutions which are the pride of Christendom he left for others to found. The loftiest intellect that ever visited our earth, he did not send the schoolmaster abroad, nor

Jesus the Light

did he establish any college or university. He might have anticipated the great discoveries of science and the inventions of art; but if these things floated in his divine imagination he anticipated none of the discoveries and applications of the ingenuity of modern times.

Neither did Jesus appear as a statesman. Twice he refused to be a judge; once he declined to be a king; the people would have crowned him, but he refused. Slavery existed in his day under his eye; the auction block was in the holy city. He heard the clanking of the chains of the slaves, and predicted that his own city would be sold into slavery; yet he issued no proclamation of emancipation. The drunkard reeled through the streets of Jerusalem, but he formed no temperance societies, he offered no man a pledge of abstinence. The courtesan walked those streets, but he organized no midnight mission to rescue her. The children played around him; he gathered them into his arms, but he left it for others to establish the Sunday school.

Why was this? Simply because he came not to mitigate but to remedy. We build inebriate asylums and found hospitals, and

Jesus the Light

improve our system of prison life, and erect poorhouses and retreats for the weak. Jesus proposes to render all these institutions of mercy unnecessary. What we consider our glory he looks upon as our shame. He places the ax at the root of the tree; he lays hold of the causes of human misery, and traces those causes back to sin. He says: "I will enthrone myself in the heart of mankind, harmonize the human will with mine, the human affections with mine, the human conscience with mine. I will live again in my Church, every member of which shall be a living, walking, talking Christ. So shall I lift up humanity."

So we end this chapter as we began it. Jesus is the Light of the World, and the history of Christendom is merely the tracing of the rays of that Light; it is watching the efforts of Torchbearers who lighted their torches there.

Jesus the Light

II

A Row of Pegs to Hang Historic Facts on

EVERYONE knows that in the history of Europe there were several centuries of almost uninterrupted sin and sorrow, of intellectual and moral gloom so profound that by common consent they are known as the Dark Ages.

Everyone knows that these years were followed by a period of steady, though slow, improvement in intelligence, refinement, and morals, which, because it opened the way for a still brighter time, was called the Middle Ages.

That bright time, when it came, was so bright in contrast with all that had gone before it that it is known to historians as the Renaissance, that is, the new birth, the second beginning of life in the world. It is not easy to recount all the causes which so suddenly changed the conditions of human life; but the discovery of America, the invention of the printing press, the discovery of the art of keeping accurate time, the

Jesus the Light

spread in the West of Eastern classical learning, and the gathering together of great kingdoms in place of the little principalities of the Middle Ages, had much to do with it.

To continue our appeal to common knowledge, everyone knows that the Renaissance was, after all, an age of transition, a sort of vestibule for the fuller blessings of Modern Times, the progressive age in which we live.

But if, from the Dark Ages, we step backward instead of forward, we find ourselves in what is known as the Classic Period, when the civilization of Greece and Rome dominated the earth.

These five periods include the whole history of the Christian Church. Let us put them in order: I. The Decay of the Classic Period (or, if you prefer, we will quote Gibbon's famous title, and say, I. The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire). II. The Dark Ages. III. The Middle Ages (which it is convenient to divide into two periods, the Earlier and the Later). IV. The Renaissance. V. Modern Times.

The remarkable thing about the facts we have just recalled is that these various periods of time are marked by Christian dates. That is to say, every year is Anno Domini,

Jesus the Light

or year of our Lord. There came into this world about the year 750, according to the way the Roman empire reckoned years, a Man, the Lord Jesus, who by his marvellous life rearranged all history, and caused people to forget all their dates, so that everything that happened before him came to be counted from the supposed year of his birth, and everything that has happened since is counted forward from the same date. The year 1, then, is the center of the world's history (although, as even the intelligent Sunday school scholar knows, our Lord was actually born nearer B. C. 4 than A. D. 1; a mistake was made in calculation, which is not strange when we observe that it was made in the depths of the Dark Ages).

The study of the history of the Christian Church becomes an easy task so soon as we recognize that a great change took place in the Church corresponding with every change which took place in the history of the world; that there was a sort of Classic Age, a Dark Age, a Middle Age, a Renaissance, a Modern Age for the Church as well as for the world; only that these are not good titles for the ecclesiastical changes, which were partly spiritual in character and

Jesus the Light

partly secular. From the days of Christ and Paul to the days of Constantine, that is, from 33 to 313—the time of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire—we have the Church persecuted by paganism. From 313 to 1073, which corresponds with the Dark Ages and the first part of the Middle Ages, we have the Church ruled by the State. From 1073 to 1517, which corresponds with the Middle Ages, we have the State ruled by the Church. From 1517 to 1750, corresponding with the Renaissance, we have the Protestant Reformation. And from 1750 to the present time we have the evangelical Church of Modern Times.

Another interesting fact that we have discovered is that one great personality stands out more really representative of each of these historic periods than all the other prominent men of that period put together. The typical man of the Primitive Church was PAUL. The man whose great intellect and iron will shaped the Church of the Dark Ages was CONSTANTINE. The man with whom the Middle Ages began was GREGORY THE GREAT. The man to whom the world mainly owes the construction of the ecclesiastical hierarchy—

Jesus the Light

the preeminent ruler of all states and thrones—was HILDEBRAND. The man who, by reason of his unique personality as well as his unique surroundings, must ever be the center of the turbulent scenes of the Reformation was MARTIN LUTHER. And the man to whom more than to any other under God we owe the aggressive, evangelistic, humanitarian, missionary spirit of the Church—of all Churches—in modern times was JOHN WESLEY.

Now we can construct a table for ourselves which will make our scheme plainer:

SECULAR PERIOD.	PERIOD OF CHURCH HISTORY.	TYPICAL CHARACTER.
Gradual Decay of Classic Civilization.	Growth of Church in spite of Pagan Persecution.	Paul.
The Dark Ages.	The Church Ruled by the State. Popes and Bishops under control of Emperors, Kings, and Nobles.	Constantine.
The Middle Ages.	The State Ruled by the Church. The Pope supreme over all monarchs.	Gregory the Great. Hildebrand.
The Renaissance.	The Reformation	Martin Luther.
Modern Times.	The Modern Church.	John Wesley.

Jesus the Light

For those who would have fuller knowledge of the onward flow of Church history through the centuries, for those who propose to make a more thorough study of it, it may be well to present a more elaborate outline—that prepared by Dr. Schaff. This outline distributes Church history into nine periods, as follows:

1. First Period.—The Apostolic Church; corresponding to the First Century and the Age of the so-called Cæsars, A. D. 1–100.

2. Second Period.—The Church persecuted as a Sect, down to Constantine, the First Christian Emperor; corresponding nearly to the Second and Third Centuries, A. D. 100–313.

3. Third Period.—The Church in Union with the Græco-Roman Empire, and amid the storms of the Great Migration; to Pope Gregory I; corresponding to the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Centuries, A. D. 313–590.

4. Fourth Period.—The Church planted among the Germanic Nations; to Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand); corresponding nearly to the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Centuries, A. D. 590–1073.

5. Fifth Period.—The Church under the

Jesus the Light

Papal Hierarchy and the Scholastic Theology; to Pope Boniface VIII; corresponding nearly to the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, A. D. 1073-1294.

6. Sixth Period.—The Decay of Mediæval Catholicism, and the Preparatory Movements of Protestantism; to Pope Leo X, the Emperor Charles V, King Henry VIII, and Luther; corresponding nearly to the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, A. D. 1294-1517.

7. Seventh Period.—The Evangelical Reformation, and the Roman Catholic Reaction in the Sixteenth Century, A. D. 1517-1600.

8. Eighth Period.—The Age of Polemic Orthodoxy and Exclusive Confessionalism; corresponding to the Seventeenth Century and the First Half of the Eighteenth, A. D. 1600-1750.

9. Ninth Period.—Spread of Infidelity, the Revival of Evangelical Christianity in Europe and America, and the Revived Efforts of the Papacy down to the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, from A. D. 1750 to the present time.

If this outline, which has in substance been used by many modern historians of the Church, be thoroughly memorized, it will

Jesus the Light

be of great advantage in all subsequent studies.

But our purpose is to present certain graphic portraitures rather than to tell a consecutive story, and for our present purpose we prefer the simple outline with which we began this chapter. Let us look at it again. The primitive conditions of the early Church were slowly passing away a little before the termination of the Classic Period of secular history. The union of the Church with the Græco-Roman empire was partly the effect, partly the cause, of the moral darkness and civil anarchy which rapidly spread over Europe. The formation of the powerful hierarchy during the days from the First Gregory to the Seventh (Hildebrand) was also part cause and part effect, and was as necessary to the future life of the Church, as necessary to the development of Christianity in this world of sin, as were even the Reformation days.

The characteristics of the Church during the five periods were what we might expect. 1. The primitive Church was characterized by holy zeal. 2. The secularized Church was characterized by corruption, and that of all sorts. 3. The chief virtue

Jesus the Light

of the hierarchy was obedience to authority.

4. The chief virtue of the Reformation was intellectual faith. 5. The characteristic of modern Christianity is sanctified common sense.

Before closing this introductory chapter it is necessary to fix in our minds definitely what the Church is whose course we are about to trace. We adopt the definition given in Article xiii of the Methodist Episcopal Church, borrowed from Article xix of the Anglican Articles of Religion: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

One word more, and we are ready to begin our study. Jesus Christ revealed the fullness of the Gospel. Nobody who has come after him has added anything to the revelation brought by him. Paul, and Hildebrand, and Luther, and Wesley, and in a lower measure Constantine, each took from Him all that their lesser natures could grasp and hold, and in God's providence their great personalities molded the Church.

Jesus the Light

"I dream'd that with a passionate complaint
I wish'd me born amid God's deeds of might ;
And envied those who had the presence bright
Of gifted prophet and strong-hearted saint,
Whom my heart loves, and fancy strives to paint.
I turn'd, when straight a stranger met my sight,
Came as my guest, and did awhile unite
His lot with mine, and lived without restraint.
Courteous he was, and grave—so meek in mien,
It seemed untrue, or told a purpose weak ;
Yet, in the mood, he could with aptness speak,
Or with stern force, or show of feelings keen,
Marking deep craft, methought, or hidden pride :—
There came a voice, ' Saint Paul is at thy side.' "

—JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Paul,
and the Primitive Church

“Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep ; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren ; in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.”—PAUL THE APOSTLE.

The Primitive Church

I

The Age of the Apostles

WHEN Jesus was born the world was to a remarkable degree intellectually active. Ovid the poet, Livy the historian, Seneca the sage, were alive; Vergil and Horace had recently died. In every field of activity men of culture and acumen were highly prized and richly rewarded. Although the great practical inventions of modern life were unknown, although men toiled without the advantages of controlled electricity and steam, and the thousand modern devices to annihilate time and space, this world has never equaled the beauty that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome.

It was a time of indescribable wealth and indescribable poverty. We read of feasts that cost the price of provinces, and of crowded cities in nakedness and hunger. Of the one hundred and twenty million Roman subjects, sixty million were slaves, and only twenty million were citizens.

A splendid civilization had been spread,

The Primitive Church

like a thin crust, over heterogeneous peoples, who were at once weary and turbulent, both in secularities and religion. The gods of Homer still furnished ready themes for poets; the solemn farce of Roman worship was acted with unchanging exactness; but few were sincere in their religion, and evidences of decay were apparent in an unparalleled corruption of public and private morals. Probably religious skepticism was never so widely diffused, nor personal purity so little valued. Nevertheless, the world loathed the vices it hugged, and with more or less of consciousness longed for spiritual truth.

The Roman empire reached from Spain to the borders of Persia. Carthage, Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, the Greek republics, besides younger nationalities in Spain, Gaul, and Germany, had been absorbed or reduced to tribute. Augustus Cæsar, first of the Roman emperors, kept his millions in subjection with an army of four hundred thousand men. His government established universal peace, and made travel possible to the ends of the earth; so that when, a generation later, the apostles went forth to proclaim the Gospel, each had the Roman

The Primitive Church

roads for highways and the Roman legions for guards.

A common language, the Greek, made the "good news" concerning Christ readily understandable by all. Greek culture and thought had been in many cases blended with Jewish convictions; and the Hebraic-Greek, a dialect formed by the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, supplied an ideal means for the clear and forcible exposition of religious truth.

The Jews of Palestine had by their very exclusiveness kept safe the seeds of truth which the Messiah was to develop in full verdure—the "law" which he was to "fulfill." The Jews of "the Dispersion"—that is, those who lived among the Gentile nations; and they swarmed by the million in Europe, Asia, and Africa—were a sort of publishing agency ready-to-hand for the dissemination of religious views.

In brief, the days when the Gospel was new were, beyond all other ages, the days when the world was ready for its Saviour—the "fullness of time" in which God sent forth his Son.

He who would trace the history of Christianity to its beginnings will find himself on

The Primitive Church

the banks of the Jordan, watching John, Andrew, Simon, Philip, and Nathanael as they group themselves about a young rabbi who has just been declared by the Baptist to be the Lamb of God. While Jesus lived there was no formulated creed, no liturgy except the Lord's Prayer, no rites but baptism and the Lord's Supper, no office bearers except the Twelve, and probably no roll of membership; indeed, there was no Church, if we use the word as it is commonly used to-day.

After our Lord's resurrection five hundred believers gathered to meet him in Galilee. We have a first hint of a roll of membership in Acts i, 15, where we are told that there were one hundred and twenty believers in Jerusalem. It was to this one hundred and twenty that the powers of eternity were revealed on the day of Pentecost. But no pentecostal miracle was so wonderful as the transformation of character which was wrought. As a consequence, the Church grew and multiplied. Peter's sermon was the means of converting about three thousand souls. A little later the number of Christians in Jerusalem was five thousand.

The Primitive Church

For a while the believers were tolerated as a sect of the Jewish religion bound together by common prayer, by the breaking of bread, and by community of goods, and conspicuous for purity of life and faith in the risen Jesus.

But when the keen spiritual vision of Stephen passed beyond the limits of Judaism he was stoned to death. This was about the year 33. About 34 Philip preached the Gospel to the Samaritans, and explained Esaias to the Ethiopian treasurer. Soon after this, perhaps in 38, Cornelius, the first Gentile Christian, was admitted into church fellowship. About the same time the word of God was preached in Antioch to Gentiles as well as Jews; and here the disciples were first called Christians. Each of these five facts—the reasoning of Stephen in the synagogues of Jerusalem; the mission of Philip the evangelist to Samaria; the baptism of the treasurer of Queen Candace; the conversion of Cornelius; and the preaching to Gentiles in Antioch—was a long step toward that discipling of all nations which had been commanded by our Lord. And each of these steps was taken against the protest of many sincere but small souls.

The Primitive Church

The Jewish Christians, especially those of Jerusalem, contended that circumcision and the strict observance of the Mosaic law were fundamental to the Christian profession; and they could not tolerate the admission of uncircumcised Gentiles to the Church. No one could become a Christian with their consent who had not first of all become a Hebrew. The founding of what was really a Gentile Church in Antioch deeply stirred their prejudices, and Barnabas was sent thither to look carefully after the new movement.

But the most memorable event in the progress of the Gospel beyond Judaism was the conversion of Saul of Tarsus—later known as Paul—a brilliant young Pharisee, who, from being the chief organizer of persecution, was turned into one of the most vigorous of the preachers of Christ. The stamp of his personality was wrought deeply into the character of the early Church. He is the first of our Torchbearers, and we will devote a chapter to the consideration of his life and its results.

The original apostles of our Lord were all Galileans by birth, except Judas, whose surname Iscariot (that is, “of Kerioth”)

The Primitive Church

indicates that he was a native of Judea. Soon after the resurrection Matthias, a man who had "compained" with the apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, was chosen by lot to take the place of Judas. Closely associated with the Twelve, around whom the early believers clustered, were Mary the mother of our Lord and his four brothers. One of these brothers, James (put to death in 62), seems to have even outranked the apostles in the church of Jerusalem.

Of the later doings of the apostles we know little or nothing. A foolish story which had currency for centuries was that they determined by lot to which country each should go. Andrew is fabled to have preached in Scythia (modern Russia), Thomas in Parthia (modern Persia), Bartholomew in India, and John Mark to have founded the church in Alexandria. James, the brother of John, was said to have carried the Gospel to Spain, Lazarus to France, while Joseph of Arimathea and Paul himself preached in Great Britain. Such legends are worthless. There is a tradition, however, which is very likely true, that the Emperor Domitian, jealous of

The Primitive Church

rivals, ordered all of the royal family of Israel to be brought before him. The grandchildren of Judas, the brother of Jesus, were the only heirs of David within reach; and when the emperor saw what harmless rustics they were he dismissed them with contempt.

The greatest of the Twelve was Peter, whose work among the Jews was as far-reaching as was that of Paul among the heathen. No one can follow the narrative of the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles without profound reverence for the matchless personality of this man, which, in the midst of uncounted blunders and weaknesses, so asserts itself that in every dilemma all eyes turn to him. When Mary Magdalene is confronted by the mystery of the resurrection, she runs and tells Peter; when the apostles find it necessary to fill up a sad gap in their ranks, they turn to Peter for counsel; when the beggar at the Beautiful Gate wants healing, it is to Peter he appeals; when the hypocrite lyingly defies the Holy Ghost, it is Peter's word that strikes him dead; when five thousand are converted by one sermon, Peter is the preacher; when all the apostles are arrested

The Primitive Church

and cross-questioned by the Sanhedrin, it is Peter makes the answer. So it continues to be till he passes from our view. The more one studies this man's career the more one is impressed by his amazing natural gifts as well as by his supernatural endowment. No doubt, if we had a full record of his life, we would find it as adventurous, as noble, and as loyal to the Saviour as the life of Paul himself. Peter was (probably) crucified in Rome about 66 or 68 by order of the Emperor Nero, and buried on the site of the present Saint Peter's Church.

Equal in prominence with Peter was John the Apostle, who left Palestine to live in Ephesus about the beginning of the war which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem. He established new congregations throughout Asia Minor; and, after a long exile in Patmos, returned to Ephesus, where, according to an almost undisputed tradition, he died near the close of the first century. His long life and his loving disposition gave him a warm place in the affections of the early Church. Another disciple of Jesus who lived at Ephesus, and concerning whom ingenious guesses have been made, was John the Presbyter. It

The Primitive Church

has been surmised by some scholars that the works and words of the two Johns have been confused; while some still maintain that there was only one John in Ephesus—the apostle of love.

The growth of Christianity continued to be rapid beyond all measurement. Men and women weary of sin, without God in the world, saw in the pure and courageous lives of the Christians the outworking of a spiritual power for which they themselves hungered. Not only at Jerusalem were thousands converted in a day. At Antioch in Pisidia the whole population was affected by Paul's preaching. At Ephesus an extraordinary commotion was produced by the apostles, and the goddess Diana was nearly deserted. At Thessalonica the apostles were recognized as notorious persons who turned the world upside down. At Rome, according to Tacitus, the Christians were a great multitude; while at Ephesus, Corinth, and Antioch they were nearly or quite as numerous. In 112 Pliny, in a formal report, states that "even through the rural districts the Christian contagion has spread." While the common people gladly embraced the Gospel, many converts of rank and

The Primitive Church

wealth were also made, such as Manaen, a foster brother of Herod Antipas; Dionysius, a member of the council of Areopagus at Athens; Erastus, the city treasurer in Corinth; Publius, the Roman ruler of Malta; Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus; Flavius Clement, one of the consuls at Rome; the "Asiarchs" at Ephesus; and Domitilla, a kinswoman of the Emperor Domitian.

Naturally, the Jewish synagogue served at first as a model for the Christian congregation. But special needs called for special officers, and we soon distinguish two classes, presbyters (elders) or bishops (superintendents), and deacons. Down to the end of the first century, however, the organization of the Church was exceedingly slight and elastic. In general, the presbyters or bishops "supervised worship, exercised discipline, administered charity, and, later, instructed the brethren in holy things;" while the deacons and deaconesses assisted them, without, however, sharing in the government of the Church. The several churches were bound together by ties of sympathy; while over all was the godly watchcare of the apostles, and their asso-

The Primitive Church

ciates and immediate successors, such as Barnabas, Timothy, and Titus. After the death of the apostles little by little the organization stiffened; and after a while the title of "bishop" was reserved for the elder chosen to preside over meetings of neighboring churches—the presiding elder, as a modern Methodist would say—while the other elders were known as presbyters.

The worship of the primitive Christians was as simple as was their government. They usually met at night—partly from fear; partly for convenience; partly because they expected the second coming of Christ "as a thief in the night." They sang hymns, read from the Old Testament Scriptures, prayed, listened to a sermon, and partook of a common meal—the love feast. Every Lord's day the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered. We find the beginnings of liturgy about the close of the first century. The Epistle of Clement (96 A. D.) contains a set form of prayer. Three formal thanksgivings to be used as part of the communion service are to be found in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, a book probably compiled at the beginning of the second century. We are

The Primitive Church

told that Saint John set an example to the Church by commemorating each year the death and resurrection of our Lord. “He observed the anniversaries, however, not always on a Friday and a Sunday, but statedly on the fourteenth and sixteenth of the Jewish month Nisan—the days of the year on which Christ died and rose from the dead.” The birth of our Lord was not commemorated in those early days.

Primitive Christianity was very far from being perfect. One has only to carefully read the closing chapters of the several epistles of Paul to recognize how—then as now—formalism, childish self-indulgence, and ecclesiastical ambition were to be found kneeling side by side with the holiest self-sacrifice. The messages to the Seven Churches of Asia in the Book of Revelation show a beautiful purity, charity, holy activity, and faithfulness to death close alongside of lukewarmness, licentiousness, and spiritual pride. But faulty as it was, to the Church of Christ as a whole in the first century, as in the nineteenth, that sublimest of sentences could be truthfully spoken: “Beloved, now are we the sons of God.”

The Primitive Church

II

The Story of Paul

PAUL presents a character unique in history. No thoughtful person can turn from the study of the life and words of Jesus to the study of the life and writings of Paul without recognizing a wide difference between the teachings of the two. Jesus spreads the doctrine of the loving fatherhood of God like a great mantle over the whole human race; Paul wraps and tucks it closely about the elect of God—those who have been chosen and adopted. Jesus rings most musical changes on the infinite love of God for each individual; Paul emphasizes the atonement, the price by which the elect of God had been bought.

This difference some regard as, after all, but the difference between the seed and the tree, between the blossom and the fully ripe fruit. All Paul's teaching is found in germ in the life and teaching of Jesus; not a single statement but is the development of some seed dropped by the Great Sower.

The Primitive Church

But this is only part of the truth. No one man was large enough to grasp the whole truth as it is in Jesus. Each apostle took all he could take; Paul, perhaps, with larger mind and larger spiritual understanding, was able to gather more than the rest. Paul's gospel, to which he so often alludes as being distinguished from the gospels of other apostles, is a higher development of certain thoughts uttered by Jesus than we could possibly have had without Paul's inspired interpretation. But even Paul could reach around only a segment of the circle, and it is left for later times to develop more fully still the precious truth, which will continue to expand and increase for us.

Undoubtedly Paul's training by the rabbis in Jerusalem gave to him certain grooves of thought; and he was never entirely free from the early bent thus given to his nature. When he became a Christian his profoundest convictions were changed; but he used the same kinds of argument and the same figures of speech that the old rabbis used. As a youth he had been taught that God was the great Universal Legislator, and that man was a mere servant bound to obey the divine law. But from the hour of his

The Primitive Church

vision on the road to Damascus, Paul conceived God as the great Giver. The rabbis had taught that a man was righteous if he obeyed God's law as set forth by Moses; Paul taught that the only real righteousness is the righteousness which God gives, and which has been secured for us by the sacrifice of Christ. His teaching concerning the mystical relation of sinful Adam to sinful mankind, concerning the uses of the Mosaic law as a sort of moral irritant, and concerning the "Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father," might almost be called original contributions to the theology of the Gospel. No other writer has brought out these truths in just the same way. Paul's conception of the Holy Spirit as the immediate source of Christian holiness has become a commonplace view of the Church in these days, but until he preached we have no glimpse of the Holy Spirit as being regarded as anything other than the source of miraculous powers. Such are some of the characteristics of his teaching.

But mighty as was Paul as a theologian, he was mightier as an evangelist. This was his great and singular glory—that he was called of God to be the Apostle of the Gen-

The Primitive Church

tiles. Through him under God we may be said to derive our modern Christianity. It was he who lifted the Church out of the choking limitations of Judaism. It is only lately that scholarship has recognized how wide was the division in the apostolic age between the Hebrew churches and the Pauline churches, and how great a debt we owe the man who saturated his soul with the thought that in Christ Jesus there was neither Jew nor Greek.

Visions and revelations were of astonishingly frequent occurrence in the life of Paul. This fact possibly affords a partial explanation of the independence and originality of his life and gospel. As he was on his way to Damascus, suddenly a light from heaven flashed round about him, and he heard a voice directing him to go to the city, where it would be told him what he was to do. In another vision Paul saw Ananias coming in and laying his hands upon him that he might receive his sight. When he returned to Jerusalem, while praying in the temple, he fell into a trance and saw the Lord, who sent him "far hence unto the Gentiles." As the prophets and teachers at Antioch (Paul among them) were ministering and fasting,

The Primitive Church

the Holy Spirit said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." "Then after the space of fourteen years," he writes, "I went up again to Jerusalem, and I went up by revelation." Withheld by the Spirit from preaching along the coast of Asia Minor, he went to Galatia. Restrained by the Spirit from going into Bithynia, he came down to Troas, where, in a vision, "there was a man of Macedonia standing, beseeching him, and saying, Come over into Macedonia, and help us." At Corinth in a night vision the Lord said unto Paul, "Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to harm thee." In his farewell to the church at Ephesus he said, "I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." At Jerusalem, on the night following that day of violence and extreme peril, the Lord stood by Paul, and said, "Be of good cheer: for as thou hast testified concerning me at Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." On his way to Rome, when ship-

The Primitive Church

wrecked, he exhorts the crew to "be of good cheer: for there shall be no loss of life among you. . . . For there stood by me this night an angel of the God whose I am, whom also I serve, saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must stand before Cæsar." In writing to Timothy of his trial at Rome he says, "All forsook me, but the Lord stood by me, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." In another place he says, if he is to boast, he will "come to visions and revelations of the Lord," which caught him up even to the third heaven, so that whether in the body, or whether out of the body, he knew not. Again he says, "But I forbear, lest any man should account of me above that which he seeth me, or heareth of me, and that because of the exceeding greatness of the revelations." He declares that he is "an apostle not from man, neither through a man;" the Gospel he preached was received not from a man, nor was he taught it, but it came "through a revelation of Jesus Christ."

Paul was born very near to the time of the birth of Jesus, probably a year or two after it; for we know that he was not more than forty when Stephen was murdered.

The Primitive Church

His native city was Tarsus, the seat of one of three celebrated universities of the classic world, the others being at Athens and Alexandria. There were thrown about him from his babyhood four distinct uplifting influences. First, he was born in "larger Greece," amid surroundings of grace, beauty, refinement, and high philosophic thought, such as we could rarely equal in the world to-day. Then, his father was a Roman citizen, a privilege which Paul inherited, and which saved him from many indignities and privations to which the rest of the world must submit. Then, his father was a Hebrew, familiar with the lofty spiritual conceptions of Moses and the prophets. Lastly, Paul was trained to be a Pharisee, one of a religious sect unsurpassed in intensity. He was sent to Jerusalem to learn at the feet of Gamaliel; he was, touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless. As all Jewish boys were expected to do, he learned a trade—that of making tents of goat's hair cloth; but he had high ambitions, and while still young was made a rabbi, that is, as another has cleverly said, "a minister, a teacher, and a lawyer all in one."

Chosen to be a member of the great San-

The Primitive Church

hedrin, Paul displayed intense zeal against the new heresy of the Nazarenes. He became a sort of inquisitor for the Sanhedrin. The vision which came to him on the way to Damascus, and which was the means of his conversion, was always regarded by Paul as an actual physical manifestation of Jesus, an evidence in itself of the physical resurrection of the Lord. His conversion should be carefully studied from the scriptural pages. It was the first step in that life-long experience of inspiration to which we have just referred.

Soon after his baptism Paul covertly withdrew from Damascus, where his change of faith had aroused bitter antipathy; spent some months in the solitudes of Arabia; returned to Damascus and remained two or three years; escaped again to avoid being murdered; and was then for the first time introduced to the apostles, who naturally hesitated to believe in his conversion. The Jews did not hesitate, however. His discussions in the synagogues of Jerusalem aroused their anger, and within two weeks he was again forced to fly, this time to his native city.

Henceforward we have so bright a light

The Primitive Church

on portions of Paul's life that we are likely to forget how large spaces remain in darkness. The catalogue of his sufferings given in his second letter to the Corinthians includes startling events of which we have no other record, and his last years are passed over in silence by the sacred writer. But from what facts we have, and from letters which were undoubtedly written by him, we may get a thorough knowledge of his character and a fair knowledge of his work as an apostle.

Summoned by Barnabas from Tarsus to the Syrian city of Antioch, Paul spent a whole year in the upbuilding of the Gentile church there (A. D. 43-44). This was the year when the disciples were first called Christians; when James the brother of John was killed by the order of Herod Agrippa; when Peter was delivered from prison by an angel. Paul visited Jerusalem with money collected to relieve the Christians there, who suffered from a great famine. Back again to Antioch he went and labored, perhaps two years, perhaps six, until the heavenly message called him with Barnabas to embark on a great missionary tour.

Paul and Barnabas went first to Cyprus;

The Primitive Church

thence to the mouth of the Cestrus, on the coast of Pamphylia, near Perga; from Perga they proceeded to Antioch in Pisidia, and from there eastward to Iconium, and as far as Lystra and Derbe in Lycaonia. Retracing their steps, they came back to Attalia, and sailed directly to Antioch. These names are only names now, and, except to the special student, do not stand for much; but in Paul's day they were as full of suggestiveness as the names of Long Island, Trenton, Susquehanna, and New York now are. For all Asia Minor was then densely populated. The Jews, who could not tolerate the offer of free salvation to the Gentiles, made bitter opposition, and the progress of the apostles was marked by commotion and riot. But wherever they went converts were made and churches were founded.

In Antioch arose the first serious dispute in the Church of Christ, a dispute which led to the earliest of Church councils—that of Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas were prominent factors in the events which brought on the controversy, as well as in the discussion which patched a temporary peace. By the efforts of these two men Christian communities of Gentiles had been

The Primitive Church

founded, not only in Antioch, but in many other parts of Asia Minor, whose simple bond of union with the mother Church at Jerusalem was faith in the Lord Jesus. To these infant Gentile churches came certain Jewish Christians who taught that the observance of the Mosaic law was a necessary part of Christian discipline. This threatened to upset the faith of many. No wonder that Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with these intruders; and no wonder that at length they were sent up to the apostles and elders about this question.

On their arrival at Jerusalem, Paul and Barnabas found that there were within the Church Pharisees ready to withstand them; but they were nevertheless accorded a patient and kindly hearing. We are not sufficiently familiar with the facts to be able to fully reconcile the account given by Paul in Galatians with that given by Luke in Acts; but from both it seems clear that the chief apostles sided with Paul, and probable that the Church did not. The outcome was a "decree," advocated by James as well as by Peter, which sanctioned the principle of Gentile Christian freedom from Ju-

The Primitive Church

daism; and which in effect separated Jewish Christians from Gentile Christians the world over, sending the Twelve to the former and Paul to the latter.

This decision seemed to settle the question of Gentile membership in the Church, but it was really only the first stroke in a long and bitter conflict. Many, in spite of the council, continued to preach the necessity of circumcision; while others, who recognized the genuine Christian character of believers who were uncircumcised, could not get rid of their own early prejudices, and regarded Gentile Christians as spiritually inferior. Paul was ever afterward bitterly opposed, if not hated, by the Judaic party in the Church. From this council, however, he came forth more generally recognized as an apostle than before.

“Already the Church has lost its formal and visible unity. The old Christians—the Jews and rigid proselytes—worship at Jerusalem, offer sacrifices, circumcise their children, and keep the Jewish Sabbaths and feasts. But the recently added Gentiles are free from the law of Moses. It is enough that they are baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. Though these believers study

The Primitive Church

the ancient word which predicted the coming of Christ, they do not ask the sons of Levi to offer sacrifice for them. They meet for prayer and fellowship at an evening meal, when they pass around broken bread and a cup of wine in thankful remembrance of the coming of the Lord, but have neither priest, nor altar, nor sacred place. They do not even look to the Twelve at Jerusalem for their highest direction and instruction, but to Paul, who 'is not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles.' ”*

To found the pretensions of a visible Church, with absolute uniformity of “orders” and services, on such a basis as that which these facts present is certainly “unscientific.” But we must continue our narrative.

From Antioch Paul planned a second missionary tour. Sad to say, a personal difference arose between him and Barnabas, so he set out with Silas. This time he went by land (51), revisited the little groups of converts which he had made in Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia; joined young Timothy to his company; broke new

* W. F. Slater.

The Primitive Church

ground in Phrygia and the Galatian region; and then, guided by a dream, crossed the Ægean to Europe; landed in Macedonia (perhaps in 52); made his first converts in Philippi; passed southward to Thessalonica, where he planted a vigorous church; southward still to Berea, followed everywhere by Jewish violence; and at last, leaving Silas and Timotheus at Berea, he fled, rather than advanced, to Athens. His famous address at Athens is a proof that he was familiar with the doctrines of Stoicism. Then to Corinth he went, where he met both peculiar difficulties and peculiar opportunities.

Eighteen months were spent in Corinth, and here he wrote his earliest apostolic letters, the two epistles to the Thessalonians (in or near the year 53). At the time the wicked Nero ascended the throne as Roman emperor Paul was making the greatest triumph of his life in and around Corinth. In the year 54, perhaps, he left Corinth for Syria; touched at Ephesus, and departed for Cæsarea and Jerusalem to "salute the Church," and then to return to Antioch.

Now comes a long and laborious missionary tour in the inland region of Asia Minor.

The Primitive Church

Paul was in Ephesus about the year 55, and here Apollos, eloquent and mighty in Scriptures, comes to view. Three years were spent in Ephesus in ceaseless Christian labors, with astonishing results, while his assistants traveled in all directions and unnumbered churches were founded. The popularity of even Diana of the Ephesians dwindled before that of this plain, earnest preacher of spiritual truth. But at length Demetrius, a silversmith, whose trade was in danger, aroused a tumult, which compelled Paul's departure. Just before he left (in springtime, 57) he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians in answer to certain questions which had been raised by the church at Corinth. From Macedonia, a little later, he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinthians; then traveled all over what is now Turkey in Europe, preaching the Gospel and gathering money from rich Gentile Christians for the poor Christians of Jerusalem. Now he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, then passed down to Corinth, and within three months wrote the Epistle to the Romans. (That there was already a strong Gentile Church in Rome seems probable.)

The Primitive Church

Full of plans for a journey to Spain, Paul returned to Macedonia; spent passover at Philippi; crossed to Asia Minor; addressed the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus; sailed to Tyre; and at length, amid prophecies of danger, reached Jerusalem, perhaps in May, 58, not long after an Egyptian impostor at the head of a huge gang of patriotic assassins, Sicarii, had seriously threatened the Roman authorities of Palestine.

In the act of a last effort to conciliate the Judaic party Paul was almost murdered in the temple of the Jews; rescued by the Roman commandant, but under the belief that the victim of the mob was the Egyptian rebel; allowed to defend himself on the spot before the multitude, and the next day before the Sanhedrin; and then, for safety, conveyed as a prisoner to Cæsarea. There, within a fortnight of his arrival at Jerusalem, he was heard before the Procurator Felix, who lingered, however, over the case, and at last, two years after, when recalled (in summer, 60), left Paul a prisoner still. At length, before Portius Festus, Paul was heard again, but as full justice was not done him he appealed in due form, as a Roman citizen, to the emperor's

The Primitive Church

own hearing, and was started for Rome, not as he had fondly expected a few months before, but as a prisoner. He was shipped for Italy, and off the Cretan coast, perhaps early in October, a typhoon struck the ship, which soon was a drifting wreck and was at last run aground at Malta. There the rescued company wintered, and not until the springtime of 61 did Paul at last see Rome. Representatives from the Church, which had now been for nearly three years in possession of the great epistle, met the captive apostle and cheered him by their sympathy.

In the city of Rome Paul dwelt in his "own hired house." A few days after his arrival he made a last long effort to convince the elders of the Roman Jews of the Messiahship of Jesus. And here for "two whole years" he lived, "years full, no doubt, of immense spiritual and mental labor and holy influence." Here were written the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians, very likely in that order. Roman tradition states that he had a school near to his hired house in the neighborhood of the Ghetto, or Jew quarter.

One of the most famous questions of

The Primitive Church

Church history is whether or not Paul's Roman residence closed with his death or his acquittal. Much has been said on both sides, and much will be said, but our conviction is that he was acquitted, and it was to this acquittal that he refers in First Timothy; that he once more undertook missionary labors; visited eastern and western Europe and Asia Minor; and that, late in this period of his life, he wrote 1 Timothy, Titus, and 2 Timothy, that last letter dated once more from a prison and from Rome. He was martyred probably in 66, when Nero's persecution was at its height. A very little while later Peter suffered his predicted death. Only a few months before these two apostles died the Jewish war had begun, which closed four years later with the fall of Jerusalem.

We have no very definite knowledge of Paul's personal appearance; but there are some suggestive hints in the New Testament, and tradition has been busy from the earliest century. It appears to be certain that he was short of stature; that his head was bald and his face bearded; and that his countenance showed the loftiness and susceptibility and power of his soul.

The Primitive Church

III

A Life and Death Struggle

As we have seen, the earliest Christianity was strictly Jewish. Peter himself was a mere layman when he entered the temple; and the Mosaic service and the discussions in the synagogue were, at first, part of the religious life of all believers in Jesus.

The earliest persecutions were Jewish in their origin, the outcome sometimes of the jealousy of the priesthood, and sometimes of the intolerance of the Pharisees.

The earliest controversy within the Church, as the careful reader will have noted, was also Jewish in its origin—an endeavor, on the one hand, to compel all Gentile Christians to become Jews, and, on the other hand, a stout resistance to this endeavor led by the apostle Paul. And the first Church council was assembled to try to make peace between these two parties.

The Church had existed thirty or thirty-five years before any hostile notice of it was taken by the Roman government. Up to about 65

The Primitive Church

the Roman government, on the whole, discouraged any molestation of Christians. But that astonishing incarnation of lunacy, genius, and devilishness, the Emperor Nero, was strangely led to undertake the persecution of this new sect. He was himself under popular suspicion of having started, or at the least greatly increased, a huge fire which destroyed a large part of the city of Rome and caused suffering hardly paralleled. It was charged that he had done this so that afterward he might have the fame of rebuilding the city in greater splendor. Other crimes of his had been so ingeniously infamous that this story was doubted by few. So to divert suspicion from himself he accused the Christians of burning the city. We need hardly wonder that he was able to transfer the accusation to them, for they were, almost of necessity, misunderstood in that corrupt age. Church meetings, held in secret, were honestly believed by thousands to be treasonable in character. "Eating the body of Christ," in the Lord's Supper, was interpreted to mean that the Christians were cannibals. A love feast, or "feast of love," was to pagan minds a riotous banquet. The power

The Primitive Church

of the Spirit was magic. Christian hymns were incantations of sorcery. Then, too, they were known to have taught that the world would be destroyed by fire.

We have abundant evidence of the horrible character of this persecution by Nero. The emperor's gardens, on the site of the present palace of the pope, were the scene of cruelties too abominable to describe. On long rows of crosses youths and maidens slowly died. Many were sewn up in skins of wolves and bears, and trained dogs were set at them. A banquet was prepared for Nero and his friends, who enjoyed the sufferings of martyrs while they ate and drank, and when the sun set many of those awaiting death were smeared with pitch and used as torches to furnish light for the executioners to kill others, while moans and prayers were drowned in music. Throughout the Roman dominion the hostile feeling to followers of our Lord extended. It was in Nero's day, as we have seen, that Paul was arrested (the second time) and killed, and that Peter also suffered death.

There is no evidence that the sufferings which Jewish and Gentile Christians thus endured in common brought about any

The Primitive Church

true fusion of the two classes. Paul's epistles were written to Pauline churches, that is, to churches made up of men of various nationalities and prejudices, whose new ideal was to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. He taught them not to regard the Hebrew ritual as needful for their salvation. In Paul's conception the Jewish Christian who still observed the Jewish law and the Gentile who laid that ritual aside were "one new man." But this "unity" (Eph. iv, 13) scarcely survived the great apostle. There were no mixed churches in the second century. Many of the Hebraistic Christians seemed to Paul to be preaching Christ out of envy, strife, and faction. Even in Paul's day "his Gospel" was largely crowded out of the Eastern churches, many of which he himself had founded. In the Second Epistle to Timothy he complains that all in Asia turned away from him.

In those Christian communities, however, which permanently prospered Gentiles came to be the majority, and Christians who observed the Mosaic law were gradually ostracized. When Jerusalem was destroyed (70) the whole system of Judaism was shat-

The Primitive Church

tered. It became impossible to gather together in the great national festivals, and the bond between the Christian Jews and Judaism broke. Guided by the counsel of our Lord, as they believed, the Christian Jews had refused to fight against the Romans; so they were regarded by their countrymen as traitors, while by the Gentile Christians they were generally repudiated as Nazarenes and Ebionites. Thus early did the Jewish division of Christianity sink into obscurity.

Gradually the eyes of the imperial government distinguished between Christianity and Judaism, and, recognizing Christianity as a new religion, became hostile to it. The Emperor Domitian (81-96) could not brook any kingdom but his own. He proclaimed himself to be Lord and God, and was bitterly offended by the Christians' refusal to worship him. So Christianity became treason to Rome, and a cruel persecution continued through Domitian's reign. It was at this time, probably, that John was exiled to Patmos. Christianity was permanently proscribed; and although the Emperors Nerva and Trajan were mild in their attitude toward it, it was still illegal.

The Primitive Church

But conflict with the empire was not the only struggle in which the early Church was forced to engage. We see from the epistles what sad work was done by the early heretics. Astrology, magic, and mysticism they mixed with biblical ideas. Paul and John stand forth as the great champions against these early heretics, who mostly came from the Jewish side of the Church. Cerinthus, a Jew of Alexandria, was one of their leaders. He taught that the divine Christ and the man Jesus were two beings, the divine Christ descending on the man Jesus at the baptism, and withdrawing from him just before his death. He taught that the body was essentially bad, and that the work of the Christ was to redeem the soul from it. Certain passages in John's writings are evidently aimed against this heresy.

Corrupt tendencies within the Church gradually crystallized in Gnosticism, a strange medley of revelation and fantastic speculation culled from the thoughts of Hebrews, heathens, and Christians. There were many varieties of Gnostics, but they agreed on certain fundamental principles. They taught that physical matter was essen-

The Primitive Church

tially evil, and that, therefore, the creation was not the good work of a good God, but a catastrophe, the work of a hostile divinity. They taught that Christ was God, and that faith in him was a divine revelation, but that his humanity was a phantom. The redemption of the soul they believed to be its deliverance from matter; and the means of grace were three—our Lord's teachings, mystic communion with God, and mortification of the flesh. This mortification led some to ascetic severity, others to licentiousness. As a basis for these teachings the genuine Scriptures were altered, by whom and when we do not certainly know. Alleged apostolic writings and alleged apostolic traditions were widely circulated, and a system of explaining the Bible as a series of allegories was introduced. Besides Cerinthus, with whom this Gnostic tendency began, we should name three great Gnostics—Basilides, Valentinus, and Marcion. Their evil doctrines were adopted by many good men, and did untold harm. Thousands were diverted from the true faith, while for years the bravest advocates of pure Christianity trembled for its future. But truth, though crushed to

The Primitive Church

earth, rose again, to live through the eternal years of God.

As men of all shades of opinions appealed to the apostles, it became of prime importance to ascertain what were the true Christian Scriptures. There are now twenty-seven books in our New Testament. By the middle of the second century we find thirty-one books generally accepted by the Churches as “apostolic,” but with some doubts concerning the sacred authority of eleven of them. Of this eleven, seven were afterward confidently accepted by all—the Book of Revelation, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Epistles of James, Jude, Peter (Second), and John (Second and Third). Four were gradually disused—the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas. Thus was the Canon of the New Testament completed.

Another apparent necessity for the protection of the Church from heresy was the formation of a creed. To the first half of the second century we trace the Apostles' Creed, though at that early date the passages concerning the catholic Church, the communion of saints, and the forgiveness

The Primitive Church

of sins had not been added to it. Neither had a passage which the Methodist Episcopal Church omits, concerning the descent of Christ into hell or hades.

Still another incidental result of the conflict with heresy was the growth of episcopacy. The apostles themselves were gone, but never had there seemed greater need for authority. Emphasis was therefore given to the position and power of that office-bearer who most nearly approached the apostles in his line of duties.

Through all turbulence of creed the Church was kept pure by opposition from without. The fires of persecution burned low at intervals, but one could never tell at what fearful moment they would leap again to flame. Two notable martyrdoms occurred in the subapostolic age. One was that of Polycarp, a disciple of Saint John, who for more than fifty years had presided as bishop at Smyrna. In the reign of Antoninus Pius he was called to seal his faith with his blood. A great earthquake had taken place. Its cause was believed to be the wrath of the gods, and who was so likely to have stirred up the old deities as the Christians who would not worship them? When

The Primitive Church

it became evident that Polycarp was to be condemned, his friends urged him against his will to withdraw from the city. But his hiding place was betrayed. When he was brought before the governor his beautiful dignity won all hearts. A clear voice sounded, "Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man;" and though that voice may have come from the healthy lungs of some enthusiastic Christian, the crowd of pagans believed that it came from heaven. The Roman governor, though unused to sympathy, shrank from condemning this venerable confessor to death, and offered to set him free if he would speak disparagingly of Jesus. What did Polycarp say? "Eighty and six years have I served Christ. He never wronged me; can I now speak evil of my King and Saviour?" He was condemned to die by fire, and was bound to the stake. All around his head the flames played like a halo, and though he died it was currently believed that the fire refused to touch his holy person.

At the trial of Ignatius the Emperor Trajan himself presided. In holy triumph Ignatius almost craved martyrdom, spoke of enjoying the wild beasts, besought his

The Primitive Church

fellow-Christians to show no such unseasonable kindness as to procure his pardon, and exclaimed, "Come, fire and cross; come, crowds of wild beasts; come, tearings and manglings, racking of bones and hacking of limbs; come, cruel tortures of the devil; only let me attain unto Jesus Christ!"

One splendid result of the conflict with paganism was the development of Apologetic Literature, or, to use less technical words, defensive writings. Christians, as we have seen, were charged with almost every vice—atheism, treason, licentiousness, cannibalism. It was necessary to prove their innocence of these charges, and the beneficence of their religion. Justin Martyr, originally a Greek philosopher, was one of the earliest of the great Christian apologists.

The early historians of the Church counted Ten General Persecutions, but to do so they had to strain history a little. Nevertheless it is convenient to have in our minds the list as given by them :

- I. By Nero ; beginning A. D. 64.
- II. By Domitian ; A. D. 95-96.
- III. By Trajan ; A. D. 106-117.
- IV. By Marcus Aurelius ; A. D. 166-177.
- V. By Severus ; A. D. 202, and onward.

The Primitive Church

- VI. By Maximin ; A. D. 235.
- VII. By Decius ; A. D. 250-251 ; continued under Gallus A. D. 251-253.
- VIII. By Valerian ; A. D. 258-260.
- IX. By Aurelian ; A. D. 275.
- X. By Diocletian and Maximin ; A. D. 303-305 ; continued by Galerius and Maximin to A. D. 311.

Polycarp received the crown of martyrdom about one century (one hundred and four years) after the meeting of that first Church council in Jerusalem which formally admitted Gentiles into Christian fellowship; about one century (ninety-four years) before the beginning of the Decian persecution, of which we shall presently speak; and about one century and a half (one hundred and fifty-seven years) before the famous day of battle when Constantine emblazoned the cross of Christ on the imperial banner.

The first hundred years of the interval which we now study (155-249) were, on the whole, years of quiet and progress. It was still a crime to be a Christian; but the Church had so grown in numbers and influence that it was to the interest of many pagans to ignore that crime. Here and there the fanaticism of the crowds broke out, and here and there the malice of some individual claimed an individual Christian

The Primitive Church

as a victim; but there was no general persecution.

Some of the worst of the emperors were among the kindest toward the Christian faith. Commodus (180-192), a characterless sensualist, and Caracalla (211-217), a brute, did nothing to encourage the persecution of Christians. Heliogabulus (218-222), a vicious man, regarded Christianity with friendliness, as akin to his own worship of the sun, while his successor, Alexander Severus (222-235), placed the bust of Christ beside that of Orpheus in his domestic sanctuary. Philip the Arabian (244-249) directly countenanced the Christian priesthood. Maximin, on the other hand (235-238), having assassinated Alexander Severus, with whom the Christian bishops were friendly, persecuted them.

In the reign of Aurelius the bitterness against Christians was intensified by a series of national calamities. They were eagerly searched for, tortured, and put to death. In the reign of Septimius, in Egypt especially and in Carthage, persecution raged; and we have terrible records of women boiled in pitch at Alexandria, and thrown to wild beasts at Carthage. From

The Primitive Church

238–249 there was unusual tranquillity, and, as before in such temporary lulls, the Christian Church prospered.

When Decian ascended the imperial throne in 249—not a bad man for those days and not wantonly brutal, one of the better emperors, on the whole—“he saw that the degenerate morals of the Roman citizenship were sapping the morals of the empire, and he believed that the old Roman virtue could only be revived by restoring belief in the old Roman religion.” Nothing seemed plainer to him than that the superstition called Christianity was the greatest force to undermine the old religion. At the outset Decius was merciful, according to his standards of mercy. Sacrifice to the pagan gods was all that he asked, and it astonished the fathers of the Church to find how many were willing to save their lives by such sacrifice. Uncounted multitudes complied with the emperor’s order, and were honored for their compliance. Others who could not at first be induced to recant did so after imprisonment and brutal torture. Still others escaped through timely concealment and flight. But many willingly endured torture and death. Origen,

The Primitive Church

one of the greatest ornaments of the Church, at this time suffered such torture that he afterward died of it. When the persecution closed it was found, as ever, that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church. Nothing made so profound an impression on the minds of the heathen as the simple-hearted fidelity with which the martyrs triumphed. In 257, under Valerian, the persecution broke out again.

But the opposition to Christianity was not all physical. Many notable intellects, convinced that it was a popular delusion, sought to overthrow it by better forces than that of persecution. Lucian has been called the Voltaire of pagan literature. He was an Epicurean, and a master of satire, who ridiculed Christianity with most effective wit, and called Jesus a sophist. Celsus was an earnest and bitter enemy, who employed all the weapons of learning, common sense, wit, sarcasm, and dramatic intensity to disprove Christianity. And there were many more.

More serious, because more earnest, was the philosophic antagonism to pure Christianity by the sect of Neoplatonists, which arose early in the third century. This philosophy did not denounce Christianity as

The Primitive Church

an imposture. It was an attempt of the more intelligent and earnest heathenism to rally its nobler energies, especially the forces of Greek philosophy and oriental mysticism, and to found a universal religion, a pagan counterpart of the Christian. Many Christian ideas were received into the system, and Jesus himself was held in the highest honor. The founder of this philosophy was Ammonius Saccas, a porter of corn in Alexandria, born of Christian parents and probably a Christian himself all his life. After his death (243) the philosophy was developed more systematically by Plotinus (died 270), by Porphyry of Tyre (died 304), by Jamblicus of Syria (died 333), and by Proclus of Constantinople (died 485). Neoplatonism superseded all other sects of heathen philosophy, and swept all other religions from among the educated classes. For three centuries it held powerful sway throughout the Roman empire, and was a vigorous rival of Christianity. Porphyry especially was regarded by the orthodox Christians as a most dangerous antagonist.

During the Decian persecution especially, and antagonizing the specious opposition of pagan philosophy, the Church produced

The Primitive Church

some of its greatest theologians. Origen (185–254)—the head of what we would now call a theological seminary in Alexandria, and in later life the founder of a similar institution in Cæsarea—was the first great commentator on the Bible; the earliest defender of the faith against literary assault; and the father of biblical criticism. He found the Greek text of the Old Testament corrupt, and rectified it. He was the first great systematic theologian of Christianity. He showed as no one before had shown how Christianity is in essential agreement with genuine philosophy. Christians were divided at that time concerning Christ, some teaching that he was only a man filled with divine power, others that he was God, but not personally distinct from the Father, himself Father, Son, and Spirit. Origen developed the doctrine of what is called the eternal generation of the Son, that is to say, that the essential relation of Father and Son subsisted from eternity. This doctrine became a foundation stone for Christian philosophy in later centuries.

Cyprian was a rhetorician, converted when far advanced in middle life (246), and two years later by popular acclamation

The Primitive Church

made Bishop of Carthage. He was a man of strict discipline and pure life. His kindness to the poor was at once munificent and tender, and his activity was absolutely tireless. In 252 a pestilence broke out; day and night he spent caring for the sick and the dead, and at its close he was the best beloved man among both heathens and Christians. Six years later he was murdered, but his death aroused pagan sympathy as well as Christian veneration. His influence on the Church was of an entirely different kind from that of Origen. Origen sought to unify it by bringing all Christian thinkers to one belief; Cyprian sought to unify it by bringing all into an outward organization. Apart from the Church he believed there was no salvation. He taught the doctrine of apostolic succession, that the brotherhood of Catholic bishops were the spiritual heirs of the apostles. The Bishop of Rome was the primate, the successor of the chief apostle Peter. Cyprian's influence turned the Christian ministry into a priesthood. Ministers were regarded thenceforth as a mediating agency between God and man, as the sole divinely authorized channel of heavenly grace.

The Primitive Church

Ritual and ecclesiasticism go hand in hand. One cause for the elaborate ritual which we find in the Church in the second and third centuries was the competition of Christian worship with pagan rites. These were impressive and many of them exceedingly beautiful, and the convert from paganism seemed to need some equally impressive ceremonial, at baptism especially, to fortify him against apostasy. So the form of Christianity came to be emphasized quite as much as its power. A spirit of Pharisaism, identical with that of ancient Jerusalem, though not manifesting itself in the same way, was developed. Every part of church architecture was prescribed, and every part of the apparel of the Christian minister; and to each part was given a meaning, like that which attached to the details of worship in the Jewish religion. Feasts and holy days became more frequently observed, liturgies were used, baptism was preceded by training in catechism which extended over years, and what in modern Methodist phraseology would be called a watch night—a night spent in wakefulness and prayer—immediately before the rite was per-

The Primitive Church

formed. The formal renunciation of the devil, which is now too often a mere matter of words, must have been impressive to those who believed that the pagan gods whom they had worshiped were devils. The candidate for baptism had the sign of the cross made in water upon his brow. He was kissed ("Greet one another with a holy kiss") by the minister who welcomed him into the Church. He was anointed, to show that he might expect the Spirit of God to come down upon him. He was clad in a white robe, to typify that his life must be pure. He received a taste of milk and honey, to show that henceforth he would be spiritually strong. And on his head the hands of the bishop were formally imposed.

During the Decian persecution the Church had been greatly shocked by the large numbers that left it. When the persecution closed many of those who had apostatized and denied the Gospel came out again as Christians. To the stricter Christians the readmission of such traitors was abominable. Montanus and Tertullian, eminent Christians, refused to admit again to the Church any who had fled from persecu-

The Primitive Church

tion or denied the Christian faith. Tertul-
lian was a great and good man, puritanic in
doctrine and ascetic in life. When in 251
a corrupt Bishop of Rome readmitted a
Church member who had sacrificed to idols,
another bishop, Novatian, was elected, and
a schism was the result. For two centuries
sects known as Montanists and Novatians
flourished, and, though the Church as a
whole took more moderate ground, the in-
fluence of these narrower and stricter-
minded men was very wholesome.

Constantine :
the Church Controlled by the State

“If the Greek was to enlighten the world, if the Roman was to rule the world, if the Teuton was to be the common disciple and missionary of both, it was from the Hebrew that all were to learn the things that belong to another world. In the highest teaching of all, Roman and Goth had to become disciples of the Jew. . . . Rome is not Rome in all her fullness, she has not risen to the true height of her mission in the world, she is not fully mistress and teacher of the nations, till she has cast aside her old gods and has bowed to the spiritual mastery of a despised sect from a despised corner of her dominion. The miracle of miracles, greater than dried-up seas and cloven rocks, greater than the dead rising again to life, was when the Augustus on his throne, Pontiff of the gods of Rome, himself a god to the subjects of Rome, bent himself to become the worshiper of a crucified provincial of his empire.”—PROFESSOR EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

The Secularized Church

I

The Story of Constantine

IT startles the student to see with what abruptness the breath of God blew out the fires of persecution. Straight from the torture room the Church was taken to the throne. In 311, by imperial orders, a wild persecution raged everywhere. In 324 Christianity was the religion of the empire. After all, the change was not so sudden as it seemed. The intellect and heart of the world were already largely dominated by Christian creed and conscience; but the formal recognition of Christianity was sudden.

At the beginning of the third century Diocletian sat on the throne, with Galerius as his colleague. Personally, Diocletian was kindly to the Christian faith, but he was unable to resist the pressure brought to use the force of the empire to secure that religious uniformity which was deemed indispensable. The Neoplatonists exerted their powerful influence against a creed which

The Secularized Church

stood in the way of the reformation of heathenism. But by this time Christianity had been graven too deeply on the heart of the world to be obliterated by persecution. A moderate computation of the number of Christians counts one out of ten of the population of the empire. When the persecution began there were, as before, many apostasies; even prominent priests abjured Christ. But while thousands were unfaithful, tens of thousands endured to the end. Hundreds of churches were torn down, and hundreds of eminent persons were sacrificed to heathen anger. In 305 Diocletian abdicated. In 311 Galerius, a pagan fanatic, issued from his deathbed an edict of toleration, signed also by Licinius and Constantine. This edict not only permitted Christians to rebuild their churches, but (astonishing to relate) requested them to remember the emperors in their prayers.

Constantine, one of the most remarkable men of human history, comes to the front with amazing rapidity. He was born in 274. Constantius Chlorus, a man of herculean energy, was his father, and Helena, a woman raised in obscurity, but in her later years famous for Christian zeal, was his

The Secularized Church

mother. While yet a boy in the army he won fame for skill and bravery. He became the handsomest man of his time, which counted much amid his barbaric surroundings. As responsibilities increased upon him he displayed singular sagacity and rare powers of administration. During his young manhood Roman public affairs were in great confusion. When his father died there were no less than six claimants to imperial power. Among the six was Constantine, who in 308, at the age of thirty-four, resisted the tyranny of Maxentius.

Between Constantine and Maxentius a tremendous battle was fought at the Milvian bridge, near Rome (312). Constantine had all along found his trustiest supporters among the Christians. Just before this battle he saw, or thought he saw, in the heavens a cross of light, with the inscription, "By this conquer." This vision was followed by a dream, in which Christ appeared to him and gave him a standard with the sacred emblem upon it. Constantine asserted his belief in the divine origin of both the vision and the dream. He emblazoned the cross on his banners and

The Secularized Church

stamped it on his shields, and while his antagonist prepared for the battle by special heathen rites, he entered it with priestly prayers, as the champion of the Christian faith. A great victory was won, which made the victor an avowed Christian, and gave to the Church and the world the first of Christian emperors. In 313 unrestricted liberty of conscience in matters of religion was proclaimed throughout the empire. Paganism was not left, however, without defenders; in the East, especially, Licinius became its champion. Constantine marched against him, and thoroughly defeated him, and in 323 was master of the world.

So it came to pass that in 324, under Constantine as sole emperor, Christianity became the official religion of the empire. From the morning of his vision he had done everything that he could do to befriend both the Church as an organization and the faith which it maintained. He had formally declared Christianity to be a lawful religion—which made further persecution impossible; he had conferred on the Christian clergy privileges theretofore enjoyed only by the pagan priesthood; he had restored to all Christians the property

The Secularized Church

which earlier emperors had confiscated; he had made great grants of public money to the Church; he had made Sunday a legal day of rest. Now he proclaimed Christianity as the imperial religion. Pagan rites had been officially performed for the prosperity of the empire; for these he substituted Christian prayers. Where pagan temples were disused he transformed them into churches. He actually preached sermons in favor of Christianity. He prepared a form of prayer for use by his soldiers, which, though not actually Christian, was strongly suggestive of Christianity. With splendid liberality of soul he refused to prohibit pagan worship, except where its rites were immoral; but he gave orders that in Constantinople—his new capital—no pagan temple should be erected, and no sacrifice should be offered to any but the true God. He abolished crucifixion, exerted his utmost force to do away with slavery, interdicted the gladiatorial contests which the cruel ancients loved, stamped out the vile crime of infanticide which in that day had many defenders, and provided systematically for the relief of the poor.

Constantine had many and flagrant faults,

The Secularized Church

to which we must not be blind. Throughout his life he continued to be head of the pagan priesthood; he officially placed pagan emblems beside those of the Church; he was at once suspicious and crafty, and capable of great cruelty when aroused; he executed a nephew for no fault of his, but simply to establish himself more securely on the throne; in a sudden rage he sent to death his own son Crispus; and in many devious ways wandered far from the crystalline and gentle life of the Son of man whom he worshiped. But we must remember the barbaric conditions in which he lived. No such moral sense prevailed then as now, and in the eyes even of the Christian priesthood what would have been wicked for an ordinary man might be justified in an emperor. In an age when most men and women were personally depraved we watch this one man, always chaste in private life, humane in legislation, zealous in his religious exercises, with such a large and noble conception of affairs that no bishop of his day could share it; and we cannot doubt the reality of his Christian enlightenment or the genuineness of his Christian belief.

The Secularized Church

It is easy now to see that certain political reasons which helped to make Diocletian a persecutor of the Church helped to make Constantine its benefactor; easy to see that both aimed at imperial consolidation through religious conformity. Admitting all this, much praise is still due to the one man who had the insight to discern before his contemporaries the intrinsic feebleness of the pagan religions and the inward vitality of the new religion. A more serious fault in the eyes of the formal Christians of Constantine's day than any of the crimes we have mentioned was the fact that he refused to be baptized till death was near; but there were probably reasons enough for this in the superstitious creed he had learned. Considering his entire career, we must recognize in him a splendid determination to serve the Lord Christ with all his heart, very similar to the determination of that other faulty king, David, to serve the Lord Jehovah with all his heart.

Not for correctness of creed nor for spirituality of life, perhaps, is Constantine to be ranked as one of the Torchbearers of Christendom. Nevertheless, to the eye of the student of history his lifework was almost

The Secularized Church

as important in shaping the destinies of the Church as was that of Paul himself. Without Paul Christianity would have remained a Jewish sect; without Constantine it would have continued in apparently helpless conflict with the heathenism about it. But the very greatest work of this great emperor was not the enthronement of Christianity. He stands forth as the human force which God used to compact and formulate the fundamental creed of the Church.

We have seen how the holy student, Origen (185-254) based the divinity of our Lord upon the doctrine of eternal generation. This doctrine is almost unthinkable, and it is not strange that in defending it he sometimes spoke of the Son of God as being a subordinate God, essentially different from the Father. The fact is that men have in all ages been too ready to imitate those angels who desire to look into the sublime mysteries of redemption; or perhaps I should say too ready, having caught a glimpse of these mysteries, to undertake their explanation and denounce all who disagree. After Origen's death two rancorous parties rose in the Church who hated each other more than either hated the pagans.

The Secularized Church

One party held that the Holy Scriptures taught that Father and Son were mysteriously One in essence; the other party held that the Son of God was the highest of all God's creatures, on whom the Father had bestowed divinity. Both appealed to the authority of Origen.

Alexandria, at this time, was a center of Christian power and influence. The learning of its ministers was famous far and wide. The good Bishop Alexander of Alexandria had his attention early drawn to two young ministers, Athanasius, a deacon of astonishing mental force, and Arius, a presbyter, perhaps the most eloquent preacher of his day. Both were men famous for learning and piety. The influence of Athanasius over his bishop was the stronger, and the bishop and the presbyter were soon in keen and bitter conflict. Arius charged the bishop with denying the distinct personality of the Son of God; the bishop accused the presbyter of denying his divinity. Great bitterness was shown on both sides. At length the bishop succeeded in having Arius deposed and excommunicated. With him went all who believed his doctrines. Now, whatever was said in

The Secularized Church

Alexandria at that time reverberated through the world, and this controversy was soon hotly argued everywhere. Laymen contended as stoutly and as publicly as the ministers. Every synod discussed the question, every market place argued it, and even the theaters ran plays which turned one side or the other into ridicule.

Constantine, having adopted Christianity, and depending upon it to hold his empire together, did not propose to have it interrupted by quarrelsome priests. No sooner did the conflict attract general attention than he exerted his powerful influence as emperor to bring the hostile parties into friendship. But these men were thoroughly conscientious and desperately in earnest. They felt that a vital truth was at stake. If one was right the other was wrong, and tremendously wrong. So Constantine's friendly efforts failed. Then he ordered each party to acknowledge the other in Church communion, and doubtless expected his orders to be as promptly obeyed in the Church as they would have been in the army. But Alexander stood on his rights as a bishop, and the emperor at length recognized that larger measures must be

The Secularized Church

taken. He called a general council of the bishops to meet in Nicæa, in Bithynia (in the summer of 325), the first general council of the Church. They came from every region of the world, Persia, Spain, Syria, Abyssinia, and Europe—three hundred and eighteen bishops. The most cultured men of the day were there, and some of the godliest men, like Spiridion, who united the office of bishop and shepherd. There were some who bore in their scarred and mutilated forms tokens of suffering for the Saviour. They met to determine in what sense Christ is God.

In his opening address Constantine made a thoroughly characteristic statement. "Discord in the Church," said he, "I regard as more dangerous than external warfare, Delay not, therefore, to dissolve all controversies by the laws of peace."

The Nicene Council was soon found to consist of three parties. The party of Alexander, made up mainly of bishops from Africa and Europe, had for its real leader no bishop at all, but the brave deacon, Athanasius. He had no vote in the council, but was given the privilege of debate. The advocates of the doctrines of Arius were

The Secularized Church

twenty in number, and were led by Eusebius of Nicomedia. The great majority of the council formed a third party, which had for its chief representative another Eusebius —“of Cæsarea”—who is famous even to-day as the historian of the early Church. This party did not favor the extreme views of either Athanasius or Arius.

Before we proceed with our account of the discussions of the council, let us glance at the character of the two great men who had precipitated the controversy.

There have been few intellects so lofty as that of Athanasius. He was the only man of his time who clearly discerned how much was at stake. With all his heart, soul, mind, and strength he believed the doctrines he maintained. Compromise he hated with inexorable hatred. When faint-hearted friends vacillated, when Constantine withdrew his friendship, when the whole force of the court was used against him, he withdrew not one inch from the stand he had taken. Five times he was exiled, and for years his life was in constant danger. We have kindlier manners now, and larger charity; but one sentence passed from the lips of this good man which for inspiration

The Secularized Church

to the heroes of God in all ages is worth a hundred octavo volumes of theology—"Athanasius against the world."

Arius was a more amiable character, though he was an ascetic in personal life. In these modern days of liberality, if not of laxity, we can hardly understand the bitterness with which so good a man was attacked by his fellow-Christians. He would be treated gentler now, and ought to be; nevertheless, if he had been treated gentler then—if in that critical moment when, under God, the Church was forming its creed looseness of thought or weakness of purpose had predominated—it is hardly likely that Christianity would have survived the Dark Ages.

Early in the sessions of the Nicene Council Eusebius of Nicomedia presented an Arian creed, which was promptly rejected. Then his namesake of Cæsarea proposed a form which declared Christ to be "God of God, begotten of all ages." This pleased the council, and would have been adopted but for a strange reason. The Arians were willing to sign it, but Athanasius, the champion of the divinity of Christ, feared to agree to anything that satisfied his

The Secularized Church

opponents, whom he regarded as teachers of pestilential heresy. So he proposed clauses which declared not only the eternal Godhead of our Lord Jesus, but that he was of one essence with the Father. His propositions were adopted, and the Arians were thus formally overthrown. Thus came into existence what is known as the Nicene Creed, the very earliest confession of faith authoritatively imposed on the Christian Church. Strong pressure by both Church and State was brought to bear upon every hesitant bishop to append his name to this creed, so that it should come forth as the unanimous finding of the council. Many delayed to subscribe to it, but only three resisted to the end, and one of them was Arius. Constantine now determined to enforce conformity. So Arius and his two Egyptian episcopal supporters were banished. And thus the conflict was settled.

But the "settlement" did not last long. The clauses added to the creed by Athanasius did not fairly represent the belief of many who, overborne by his forceful personality, and anxious for an agreement, had voted for it. These bishops in many places admitted Arius to their synods, and voted

The Secularized Church

with them in very practical antagonism to the creed. Constantine, true to his policy to maintain harmony, and finding that he could not enforce opinions, swung back to his earlier method and again undertook to enforce toleration. Back from his exile Arius was summoned, to be restored to Church fellowship in Constantinople. But just before the act of restoration he suddenly died (336). Neither the favor of the emperor, however, nor the death of Arius could change the inexorable Athanasius. He persistently refused to fellowship with Arius in life or to recognize his Christianity after death, and as a consequence Athanasius was banished by Constantine.

In 337 the great emperor died, and his son and successor, Constantius, sympathized with the Arians. A very powerful reaction against the Nicene Creed now set in. In 359 another creed was adopted, in which the Son was declared to "resemble the Father in all things according to the Scriptures." Good old Jerome wrote, "The world is astounded to find itself Arian." Constantius died in 361, and then the countercurrent was again felt. For years the Church was agitated by strife between the advocates of

The Secularized Church

the doctrine that the Father and the Son were of "one essence" (Homousios) and the advocates of the doctrine that they were of "like essence" (Homoiousios). Each party was persecuted in turn. Gradually the believers in Christ's divinity again clustered around the Nicene Creed, and a second general council, held in Constantinople (381), readopted that creed, and ever since it has been recognized as one of the bases of Christian theology. It is well to note here, however, that during the controversy the Arians had shown missionary enterprise, and Goths and Vandals were Christianized by Arian missionaries—a fact that had much influence on later history.

The moderate policy of Constantine was strangely departed from by his son Constantius and other successors, who attempted by force to suppress paganism. Paganism, indeed, was reinstated for a time, 361–363, by Julian the Apostate. But the reaction which took place after his death was severe. Heathen temples were thrown down, their revenues were confiscated, and their rites interdicted, and before long to be a pagan was to be a criminal. Of course only evil results could come—the admission into the

The Secularized Church

Church of thousands of worldly-minded people, the consecration of unscrupulous court favorites as ministers of Christ, and the adoption of pagan usages into the worship and life of Christianity.

The Secularized Church

II

Fightings Without and Fears Within

WE must now with rapid strides pass down the centuries to the close of the Dark Ages. It will be impossible in a few pages to give any adequate conception of the degradation into which Europe sank. The civilization of Greece and Rome was almost swept from the earth by successive invasions of barbarians. The empire in the East became weak. The city of Rome was in ruins, although it continued to be relatively a seat of power. No government on earth was strong enough to insure the safety of property. Might made right. The nobility were the strongest men who could take and keep. Dense ignorance fell like a night over all the earth. Even an educated priest was a rarity. Lofty conceptions of morality departed from the common people.

During these Dark Ages we take note of three historic facts, widely divided in time and place, but of importance in the long struggle of the defense of the truth

The Secularized Church

against pagan hostility and heretical tendency.

The first was the sack of Rome by Alaric (410), a pivotal event in the world's history. Alaric was a Gothic chief, one of the fearless barbarians who, in successive waves, had during four centuries swept out of the East and overflowed the fertile valleys of central Europe. He differed from some of his predecessors in being a Christian; but he was an Arian, and therefore as horrible to the conception of the orthodox Christians of Rome as if he had been a cannibal.

The weak empire had called on this vigorous barbarian to assist it as an ally, but the empire was perfidious and did not keep its promises. Alaric was not a man to be trifled with. He marched to the gates of Rome, and would not depart till he had received a heavy bribe. The next year he attacked it again and enthroned an emperor of his own making. The third year he let his burly Goths loose on the fated city—men who had neither fear nor remorse. They killed all that opposed them, stole all that pleased them, and destroyed all that they could not understand.

And yet through the midst of the blood

The Secularized Church

and agony of this sack there was a conviction in the minds of Christians in and out of Rome that Alaric was God's instrument for religious progress. Many stories were told which fortified this belief. One of them was that of a monk who passed through great dangers to reach the presence of Alaric and entreat him to spare Rome, to whom Alaric replied that he greatly desired to do so, but morning, noon, and night he heard a mysterious voice that urged him on.

Important results followed the sack of Rome. In spite of the fact that it was the Western capital of the Christian emperors its aristocracy was pagan, and through the centuries the splendid rites of paganism were performed in its temples. Alaric destroyed all this so thoroughly that paganism never again reared its head. Then, too, after Alaric's invasion the power of the emperor in Rome dwindled away. Priesthood took the place of magistracy. Innocent I, who was pope at the time, became the practical ruler of the city. During the century which followed the title of Pope, which had been heretofore given to all Western bishops, was restricted to the

The Secularized Church

Bishop of Rome. These were the beginnings of papal supremacy.

A second notable fact which shaped the Church in the Dark Ages was the advent of two or three holy men of gigantic intellect. By far the greatest of these—one of the greatest of all Christians—was Augustine. He made the sack of Rome the text for his great book, *The City of God*. He was born in 354 in North Africa. In his youth he gave the reins to appetite. When sated with sensuality he turned to one of the heresies of the day, Manichæism, but got no comfort for his soul. He then became a skeptic; then a Platonist; and at length, at the age of thirty-three, was converted by means of “the tears and prayers of his mother Monica, the study of Paul, and the preaching of Ambrose at Milan.” In 395 he was made Bishop of Hippo, and for thirty-eight years his humble home and church became the intellectual and spiritual center of Western Christendom. He anticipated many of the most precious doctrines of Protestantism. He emphasized the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the necessity of a personal experience, and yet he believed in baptismal regeneration and many others

The Secularized Church

of the doctrines of the modern Roman Catholic Church. Great as were his books, he himself was greater. His lofty character has been the glory of Christendom in all succeeding ages. His life was in full consistency with his own beautiful address to the Lord, "Thou hast made us for thee, and our heart is restless till it rests in thee."

Next to Augustine in fame was Jerome (born 340, died 420). For the age in which he lived he was an astonishing scholar. He founded a monastery at Bethlehem, and translated the Holy Scriptures into Latin. As Latin was then the speech of the common people this version became known as the Common Version, or Vulgate. When Jerome translated it some good men thought he had committed a sin, for they looked on the very words and letters of the original Scriptures as sacred. But when, ages afterward, it became necessary again to translate the Bible for the common people, some good men thought that it was a sin to depart from Jerome's translation. Thus it has always been.

Another great man we can only mention — John Chrysostom, or John of the Golden Mouth. He was born ten years after Je-

The Secularized Church

rome, four years before Augustine. He was unapproachable in his eloquence, a conscientious reformer. He became Bishop of Constantinople. But his life was stormy, because of his conscientious maintenance of purity. He died in exile, and his last words were, "Glory to God for all things."

Patrick, who evangelized Ireland, lived in the early part of the fifth century, and as a consequence of the purity of his doctrine and of the isolation of his field Ireland became for centuries a center of spiritual life. Patrick's name originally was Succat. He was the son of a Christian deacon, stolen from his home to become a slave in Ireland. Although he was able to escape from slavery a vision or dream sent him back, and his success in converting the Irish was astonishing. When he died in 493 hundreds of churches and monasteries had been founded, and his converts became the pioneers of Christianity in central Europe.

The next two pivotal facts of the Middle Ages both occurred in the autumn of 451.

The battle of Chalons was fought by Roman soldiers and Teutonic warriors on one side, and on the other the pagan Tartar

The Secularized Church

Attila the Hun, who delighted in the title "Terror of the World." The Christians called him "The Scourge of God." He boasted that he would turn Europe into a vast hunting ground, and he nearly carried out his threat. He had already turned Germany into a wilderness. Crossing the Rhine, he precipitated a crisis in the history of Christendom. The opposing armies met at Chalons. The battle was tremendous. According to the chroniclers of the day one hundred and sixty thousand men perished on the battlefield. But Attila was vanquished, and again Christendom was saved from impending ruin.

While the warriors of the West were defending their homes and Church against wild pagans the ecclesiastics of the East assembled in Chalcedon to discuss and denounce a number of heresies. We can only mention the names of three heresies which this council anathemized. Larger books must be referred to for the peculiarities of the creeds—Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, and Monophysitism. The council declared our Lord to be complete both in Godhood and manhood: "Of two natures united indissolubly and inseparably, but without

The Secularized Church

intermingling or passing over into each other; the distinction of the natures being in no wise abolished by their union." This mystery of the incarnation can never be solved by the human mind; but the declaration of the council at Chalcedon assisted greatly in the establishment of an intelligent Christianity.

The Secularized Church .

III

Benedict and the Early Monks

WE must glance back for a moment to the time when Alaric sacked Rome. "Amid the social trouble and political upheaval which this conqueror introduced, a movement destined to become a power in Christendom received a potent stimulus—Monasticism. As a Christian institution it originated early in the fourth century, although its germs appear in the preceding age. It arose in Egypt, where monastic life had long been known among pagans and Jews. Anthony, the Coptic saint, who lived for over half a century in the desert, is reckoned the 'patriarch of Christian monks,' the 'childless father of an innumerable seed.' Monasticism began in the form of hermit life, devout, ascetic, celibate; before long it assumed also the phase of brotherhoods living together in pious seclusion. The first great impulse to the movement was given by the establishment of Christianity as the imperial faith. In

The Secularized Church

times of persecution aspirations after a higher than ordinary religious life found satisfaction in faithful Christian profession; now, when profession was general, they sought realization in withdrawal from secularized Christian society.

“ Monasticism at first advanced most in the East, where Basil the Great drew up a monastic rule substantially in force to this day. In the more practical West, notwithstanding Augustine’s approval and Jerome’s advocacy, the progress of the movement was slower. Jovinian of Rome and others boldly denounced it; only in Gaul, under Martin, the soldier-saint and Bishop of Tours, it attained, during the fourth century, marked success. From Alaric’s invasion its growth into importance in the West may be dated. The wreck of earthly hopes and fortunes, which Gothic devastation entailed, caused multitudes of men and women to turn for solace to a life of devotion; many more amid political instability entered monastery or convent as a refuge from real or fancied peril; while for others sudden impoverishment made the plain but sure monastic fare a welcome provision. Thus social straits combined with religious

The Secularized Church

aspirations to stimulate the growth of the movement." *

In 494 a lad of fourteen, living in the neighborhood of Rome, became disgusted with the viciousness of the boys and girls about him. He left home and abode in a cave, spending his time in prayer. He would have starved if a neighboring monk had not saved enough of his own food to succor him. As he grew in years he grew both in piety and in sound sense. When the fame of his sanctity drew others about him he governed them with wisdom. He is known as Benedict of Nursia.

In 528 Benedict was driven away from the twelve monasteries which he had founded near Rome, and retreated to Monte Casino, where now stands one of the most famous monastic buildings in Europe, midway between Rome and Naples. Here, one year later, his famous Rule of Life was drawn up, and what afterward was known as the Benedictine order of monks was founded. Until Benedict's day monks had acted as they pleased, and some of them lived lives as corrupt as those of the wicked world from which they had fled. Benedict's Rule

* Dr. Cowan,

The Secularized Church

enjoined a vow of steadfastness, obedience, and reformation. Every monk must be steadfastly a monk for life. All monks must obey their abbot, prior, and deans. Every monk must live a life of self-sacrifice, prescribed for him in detail. He could own nothing. He must eat and fast according to orders; his devotions and labors were all prescribed; and the monastic life was turned into a round of stated duties. A uniform dress was provided, and in everything both excessive devotion and needless self-indulgence were avoided. Out of every twenty-four hours seven were spent in worship and seven in work.

Benedict himself had no thought how widespread and time-long would be the influence of his Rule, but in one hundred years after his death it was practically adopted by all the monks of Europe; it became dominant throughout Catholicism, and its influence even on Protestant Christianity is felt to-day.

Monasticism developed at certain times and in certain places all along its history fatal evils. There were tendencies to vice and self-indulgence, which, in spite of all rules, it at times seemed to favor, and there

The Secularized Church

have been many wicked monks. Nevertheless, under God monasticism was the backbone of Christianity in Europe. The monks taught the priests to pray and the laity to work. Monasteries stand forth in the midnight of the world's intelligence doing duty as hospitals, colleges, cities of refuge, model farms, missionary societies, publishing houses—representing, in short, almost every beneficent force that can work among mankind.

Gregory the Great,
and the Early Middle Ages

“ Rome was not as other cities; and the Bishop of Rome could not long remain like the presidents of other churches. He was dealing with the subjects, and he lived in the heart, of the empire. It was inevitable that the imperial tradition should fasten on the object of their worship; nor was it long before the exulting cry went up to heaven, ‘ Christ lives, Christ rules, Christ is emperor!’ (*Christus vivit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat.*) As the vicars of this invisible emperor, the popes acquired gradually a power which overshadowed that of mightiest sovereigns.”—SIR GEORGE W. COX.

The Hierarchy

I

The Story of Gregory the Great

MR. JOHN FISKE has somewhere called attention to the fact that most of the great revolutions and transitions of history have not been recognized as historic periods by those who lived at the time. Such a transition occurred during the time of the apostle Paul; it changed Christianity from a Jewish sect to the Church of the Gentiles. Such a transition occurred in the early Church of the fourth century, when the primitive Church was developed into a system of imperial Christianity. A third great change occurred at the end of the sixth century, when we begin to recognize the Church of the Middle Ages.

The Eastern Church had become corrupt, and was being slowly crushed by the despotism of the Eastern empire, while just in the future, though no man yet knew it, was the great catastrophe of the Mohammedan conquest. In Western Europe new states came turbulently struggling toward the

The Hierarchy

front, their ecclesiastical interests being so mixed up with their civil polity that it was impossible to separate the two; while Rome more and more became the center of Western Christianity.

The man who is known to history as Gregory the Great was born about 540. He came of a Roman senatorial family, and before he was thirty was Pretor of Rome. Five years later he had become thoroughly disgusted with politics and with all secular affairs, and had, in the spirit of the times, consecrated his time and his property to religion. Becoming a Benedictine monk, he founded six monasteries in Sicily, and gave his own palace, rich with the memories of his proud family, to the Benedictine order as a monastery. Made abbot of this establishment, he disciplined himself more severely even than he disciplined those that were under him, so that his activities were constantly broken in upon by illness. His political abilities being recognized, he was made papal legate to Constantinople, and was very influential there.

Returning to Rome, in 584 he became secretary to Pope Pelagius. Wandering one day through the slave market of Rome,

The Hierarchy

he saw some youths and maidens exposed for sale, whose fine complexions and lofty countenances won his heart. They were Anglians, or English. He forthwith determined to undertake the conversion of the English, but Pelagius would not release him, and when that pope died in January, 590, all Rome insisted that Gregory should be his successor. He did his best to escape the dignity, but the pressure was too great.

The Church was in a deplorable condition. "It is an old and tattered ship," wrote Gregory, "admitting the waters on all sides; its timbers rotten, and shaken by daily storms and sounding of wreck." Corruption, heresy, and schism prevailed everywhere. But Gregory's coronation was the coronation of monasticism. He set himself, with marvelous activity and capacity for affairs, to do everything that a lofty-minded pope should do: to rebuild ruined churches, to defend the country, to convert the heathen, to prevent war, to reclaim the heretics, to govern the great ecclesiastical organizations, to discipline the monks, to manage his own farm, to relieve the poor about him.

With all his might he was a Christian,

The Hierarchy

and with all his might he was a Benedictine monk. He turned to his fellow-monks when he wanted to make new archbishops and papal legates; he officially sanctioned the Rule of St. Benedict; he protected the monasteries from the bishops, and the property of the monks from knights and princes. He spent many hours every day in learned studies. He shut himself out from all society but that of monks and clergy.

Gregory greatly improved the liturgy of the Church, and almost remade its service, and superintended in person the rehearsals of the choirs. He was one of the most powerful preachers that ever lived, and his awe-struck congregations almost fancied they saw the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove hovering about him to inspire his words.

The income of the pope was prodigious. Every penny of it he gave for the relief of the needy. One day a poor man was found dead in the streets. Gregory was struck with most penetrating remorse, and could never forgive himself the crime of sustaining his own life in a city where a fellow-being was starving. One day, like the humblest of monks, he set dishes on the table to entertain a stranger, and when the

The Hierarchy

poor tramp had eaten and drunken (so the simple people of the time believed) a beautiful halo curled around his head; it was the Saviour; he said, "On other days thou hast relieved me in my members, but to-day in myself."

To missionary efforts Gregory gave great impulse. In 597 he sent Augustine to England to carry out his own long-cherished purpose of Christianizing the English. Augustine became the first Archbishop of Canterbury. The Anglo-Saxon Church, founded by Augustine, produced in the seventh century Willebrord the apostle of the Netherlands, and in the eighth century Boniface the apostle of Germany. But before this, as we shall presently see, Christianity had been introduced to the British islands. Columba, a Christian but not a Romanist, had founded the Scottish Church, and Columbanus came specially as a missionary to Burgundy and Switzerland. The Celtic Church and the Roman Church, both of them thoroughly British, came into deep and irrepressible conflict, and in 664, in a council at Whitby, the Celtic Church was worsted, and in the eighth century absorbed the older British Church.

The Hierarchy

Gregory founded the mediæval papacy; and, whatever we may be disposed to say of the evils that attended the development of papal power, it became, in the hands of God, a great central force of order and justice, and consolidated European Christianity. In conserving and increasing the power of the Roman see in Gaul (that is, France), Spain, and also in Africa he displayed fine statesmanship. His legates became the counselors of princes and bishops in various lands, and kept all parts of Europe in touch with Rome.

With the Eastern Church he took his stand on equality of mutual independence. He recognized the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria as his equals. As he did not himself claim to be universal bishop, he denied the right of the patriarchs of Constantinople to make such a claim. After a while a serious quarrel arose between Gregory and the Patriarch of Constantinople, which later developed into a quarrel between the pope and the Eastern empire. The cause of the bitter feeling, which was not appeased during the lifetime of either of the principals, was the assumption by the Patriarch of Constantinople of the title

The Hierarchy

of universal bishop. Strange to say, a century had not passed before the successors of Gregory themselves assumed this title. Toward heretics he was tolerant. He protected the Jews, and severely reprimanded brutal efforts made to convert them by force. Full of sympathy was he. The character of the old Emperor Trajan so delighted him that he prayed earnestly that God might yet give the soul of the emperor grace to know the name of Christ and to be converted.

Before Gregory's time there was wide diversity in the liturgical practices of Churches in different parts of Europe. Especially did the Gallican liturgies differ radically from the Roman. In a day when the service was almost all liturgy the questions that arose of necessity reached far. Gregory compared these varying forms, and prepared a revised liturgy, which was so much better than any in existence that in any case it must soon have supplanted the others. But that was a day when it was not supposed that any good deed could be done without force, and papal authority was used to make universal the use of Gregory's liturgy.

The Hierarchy

Gregory's hymns have been favorites of the Church in all ages. Luther thought his hymn on the passion the best ever written. In the Methodist Hymnal there are three beautiful hymns by him: 240, "O Christ, our King, Creator, Lord;" 269, "O come, Creator Spirit blest;" and 273, "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire," which last is used in the public ordination of ministers. Two of the tunes in the Hymnal and two of its chants are also credited to this great pope, who was as eminent in music as in poetry.

We must measure all men by their times. Gregory, great and learned as he was, was ignorant of the Greek language. In his *Dialogues* he shows himself to have been exceedingly credulous concerning the miraculous legends current in the Church. He states distinctly the doctrine of purgatory, more distinctly than any early writer, and teaches the duty of saying masses for the relief of departed souls. Matt. xii, 32, seemed to him a proof of the existence of purgatory.

Gregory strongly advised the monastic life, but he condemned excess; and though he himself did not believe that the clergy

The Hierarchy

had any right to marry, he could never be brought to sanction the separation of those already married. It has been claimed by some that he did not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, but a fair interpretation of his language would make him not only a believer in it, but a champion of it. His letters abound in passages showing a great reverence for relics; he believed profoundly in their importance. By his order bones of saints were deposited in all newly founded Churches, and he bestowed on certain converts keys into which were wrought filings from St. Peter's chains. He believed that a certain cloth which had once wrapped a holy man had flowed with blood when it was cut.

Gregory spoke against the worship of images, but says, "Painting is used in churches that they who are ignorant of letters may read on the walls what they cannot read in books;" and he justifies prostration before the crucifix. Augustine, whom he sent to England to convert the Saxons, came "bearing a silver cross for banner, and the image of the Lord the Saviour painted upon a board."

We see from these rapid glances at his

The Hierarchy

life that he was a composite character, a man of many imperfections, but always noble in purpose. He was as crafty and apparently insincere in some of his political dealings as any modern political "manager;" but his life was unselfish, his ambition was for what he understood to be the Church of Christ, his purposes were worthy, his patriotism was intense, and his philanthropy as disinterested as that of Howard. In his daily life he set a holy standard to all the monks. His life was a life of conscientious service to God. He was by far the greatest and best man of his day, and richly deserves the title that posterity has given him—Gregory the Great. Howbeit, as we shall presently see, there was a greater Gregory than he.

The Hierarchy

II

The Story of Mohammed

WHILE Gregory was reforming and reorganizing the Christian Church in Europe a boy was growing up to manhood in Arabia who was destined to bring about one of the greatest religious revolutions in the history of the world.

At this time Eastern Christendom was deplorably degraded. The emperors had compelled every conquered race to become nominally Christian, and they brought all their superstitions and pagan practices with them. The Church was absolutely dependent on the empire, and court favorites were put in lofty positions. The ablest minds among the clergy frittered away their opportunities in learned discussions of impracticable theories. The ritual was uniform, but uniformly degraded.

The early life of Mohammed was spent in obscurity. He became wealthy by marrying the widow Khadija. He was epileptic, profoundly religious by nature, and influ-

The Hierarchy

enced from infancy by the doctrines of a corrupt Judaism and heretical Christianity. His fits and hysteria he at first shrank from, believing them to come from the devil; but as what he uttered when under their influence and after his recovery from them was spiritual in tone, his wife persuaded him that they were revelations from God. So he became a prophet. Slowly he made converts; the first was his wife, the second was his cousin, the third was an intimate friend. He was persecuted by the elders of Mecca, and fled to Medina in 622, when he was about fifty-two years of age.

This flight or Hegira furnishes the date from which the Mohammedan calendar is reckoned. He soon became the most powerful personality in Medina. He was eloquent, handsome, charming in manner, and full of religious enthusiasm. Such reforms as he instituted had never been known in Arabia. Little by little he united to him other Arab tribes, marched to Mecca in 630, destroyed idolatry, and became the master of Arabia. Two years later he died, probably of poison.

Mohammed's doctrine was far superior to those it displaced. His one purpose was to bring his countrymen to the true worship of

The Hierarchy

God. There is no doubt that he himself thoroughly believed in his "revelations." In his early career he confidently expected that the Jews, the ancient people of God, would support him, but when they rejected him he hated them with fanaticism. During the last two years of his life the thought of being the national prophet seems to have been superseded in his mind by the loftier thought of destroying the idolatry of the world. He was profoundly devoted to what he understood to be the will of God, and yet is chargeable with craftiness and cruelty.

Mohammed believed that God revealed the one pure religion to all the prophets, from Abraham to Christ, and it was his business to bring back the world to that religion. The Koran is not original; every story in it may be found either in the Bible itself, in apocryphal gospels, or in the fables of Jewish rabbis. The thought of the dominance of God's will was emphasized by Mohammed beyond anything known to Jewish religious thought. He scorned the thought that there could be any mediator between God and man, and his teachings concerning the law of God led eventually to fatalistic doctrines.

The Hierarchy

The prosperity that was to come to the world from the reign of Mohammed and his successors was to fulfill and surpass all the Hebrew ideas of a Messianic reign of righteousness and peace. He pictured the torments of hell with Miltonic realism. The joys of paradise, as he describes them, with dark-eyed houris, and gardens, and palaces, must ever seem to Christian minds singularly sensuous; but with them were intertwined many exalted spiritual conceptions. He believed in the prophetic mission of Christ, but held in contempt the doctrine of his divinity, and laughed outright at the thought that God could have a son. The moral light that he introduced into Arabia, and his successors spread through so large a part of the world, was dim, but was far superior to that which it outshone, and in morals the early Mohammedans had higher tone than the Christians they fought against. Even Mohammedan polygamy was better than the loose concubinage which prevailed almost everywhere in Christendom at that time.

The spread of Islam was not checked by the death of the prophet. Its armies soon gathered about the chief fortresses of the

The Hierarchy

Christian world, and before many years passed a large section of Christendom had fallen into Mohammedan hands. By 650 Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Persia had submitted to their rule. Before 700 all North Africa had followed, and the successors of the prophet ruled over an empire as large as that of the successors of Constantine. By 711 Spain and Portugal had been conquered. A few years later the Pyrenees were crossed, and South France was overrun. In 717 a Moslem army threatened Constantinople. All Christendom seemed about to be submerged under the tide of Mohammedan invasion. But there was a burly soldier, Charles of France, who determined to save Christendom from Islam. He had been nicknamed the Hammer; "Martel" it was in the dialect of the time. After many preliminary struggles a tremendous battle was fought at Tours between the Christians, under Martel, and the Moslems, and the result of that battle was the saving of Europe to Christianity. The Mohammedans were absolutely defeated, and were thrown back beyond the Pyrenees.

The Hierarchy

III

Boniface, and the Mediaeval Missionaries

WHILE the boundaries of Christendom were thus being restricted on the East and South, the Gospel was being planted in the heathen regions of the North. In Germany and Saxon England there were many hindrances to its introduction. The doctrine of the supremacy of Rome and a ritual in a foreign language were offensive to these liberty-loving people. Nevertheless conversions were rapidly made. We have seen how Augustine introduced Christianity to England. Long afterward, however, we find pagan princes there. Edwin of Northumbria was one of the most powerful of these. He married a Christian princess. She brought with her a bishop. Edwin admitted the folly of paganism, but could not persuade himself of the truth of Christianity. He assembled his wise men to decide the question. While they deliberated, one hoary-headed sage said, "O king, the life of man on earth is like to the swift flight of

The Hierarchy

a winter sparrow through a room. The sparrow flies in at one door and out at another. While he is in he is safe from the storm, but he comes from wintry darkness and passes out to wintry darkness. Such is the life of man. Of what went before we know nothing, of what is to follow we know nothing. If therefore these Christian teachers can tell us anything certain, let us follow them." The conversion of the tribe followed. The high priest of paganism became a Christian. A long strife followed between the earlier British Christianity, which had come from Ireland, and the Saxon Christianity, which was Roman.

Germany found its apostle in Boniface, or Winfred. He was an English monk, who profoundly believed in Rome and the papacy; he was characterized by genuine Christian piety. The Hessians were converted by him in 722. He was made bishop, and persuaded to swear loyalty to the chair of St. Peter. He was put under the protection of Charles Martel, whose heroism at Tours we have noted. The personal bravery and holy zeal of Boniface can hardly be exaggerated. There was an old oak tree much sought as the residence of the god of

The Hierarchy

thunder. For hundreds of miles about the people gathered to it as to a holy place. Boniface dared to cut it down, and out of its timber built a church to Christ. No task was too great for him. He sought to bring ecclesiastical uniformity into Germany and France. The monasteries founded by Boniface and his followers became centers of scholarship for all Germany.

A papal letter indicates that one hundred thousand converts were brought into the Church by his labors. In 755 he was murdered by pagan Frisians. When his murderers came they were animated by the belief that he had in his possession sacramental plate of gold and silver. Seeing that his own life was aimed at, he restrained his followers from resistance, laid his head on his beautifully illuminated copy of the Gospels, and calmly invited the assassin to strike the fatal blow.

The further extension of Christianity throughout northern Europe belongs to the story of Charlemagne.

The Hierarchy

IV

Charlemagne, and the Holy Roman Empire

CHARLEMAGNE, or Charles the Great, was by race a Frank. The Franks, when first we hear of them, dwelt on the east bank of the Rhine; but afterward they conquered the country which was then called Gaul, but has since been called, from the name of its conquerors, France.

The grandfather of Charlemagne was Charles Martel, who won the battle of Tours in 732. He was not King of the Franks, but only the chief officer of the king; but his son Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, became king.

Charlemagne was born in 742. When a boy he was not sent to school, for in the midnight of the Dark Ages learning was forgotten. But he was taught the various arts of war; and while still a boy he accompanied his father on an expedition against the Lombards in Italy, and thus had early experience of actual warfare.

It was in return for his services against

The Hierarchy

the Lombards that the pope made Pepin King of the Franks. Charlemagne was only a boy of about twelve when, with pomp and ceremony, his father was anointed king, and he himself was baptized, by the pope's own hands, at Munster. Pepin looked upon himself as the champion of the pope and Christianity against the heathen.

When Charlemagne became king in 768, at the age of twenty-six, he too made it his greatest aim to defend and extend Christianity. He had not been long king when he led his army against the Saxons, a wild people in the north of Germany, numbers of whom had gone over to Britain more than three centuries before, and were now masters there. The object of this war was to convert the heathen to Christianity, "the true and saving faith."

The ugliest blot on the memory of Charlemagne is an act of cruelty which he committed upon the Saxons, who, if they were fierce and rude, showed great courage in the way in which they struggled against the power of the great king. For thirty years their struggles lasted, during which the Saxons were repeatedly subdued, but re-

The Hierarchy

peatedly rebelled. At last on one occasion Charlemagne had hardly left their country, after making arrangements for peace, when he heard that they had again risen. In anger at this breach of a treaty just made he hastened back and ordered four thousand prisoners, who refused to become Christians, to be put to death. Even after that the Saxons rose against him under their leader Wittekind; but they were finally defeated, and Wittekind and his wife were obliged to be baptized and to adopt the Christian religion. Then Charlemagne took great numbers of Saxons from their homes, and sent them to other parts of his empire; and he was never troubled by them again.

During these thirty years the great kingdom which Charlemagne had inherited grew on all sides. In 774, at the request of the pope, whom the Lombards had attacked, he besieged their king in Pavia and conquered him, after which Lombardy became part of his empire.

After this comes a long series of campaigns, which had no direct bearing on the history of the Church—against the Moors in Spain, against the pagans of the Danube, and against many other enemies of Chris-

The Hierarchy

tianity and good order. The dream of his life was the union of the countries he had conquered—of all the heathen tribes that for centuries had been constantly at war with one another—into one great empire, the new empire of the West, in which the power and the learning of ancient Rome should be united with the religion of Christ.

This dream must have seemed to be realized when, on Christmas Day of the year 800, in St. Peter's in Rome, the pope brought forth a crown and placed it on the head of Charlemagne, hailing him as "Emperor of Rome," while hundreds of voices reëchoed the words. So a barbarian and a Christian assumed the crown which Cæsar's fellow-citizens would not let him wear. The Roman empire of the West, which had fallen more than three hundred years before, was now restored.

The remaining fourteen years of his life Charlemagne spent chiefly in strengthening the boundaries of his empire, in trying to spread among his subjects a knowledge of the arts of peace, in founding schools, and in encouraging learning. Learned men from all countries were invited to his court ;

The Hierarchy

and one in particular, the great English scholar Alcuin, was persuaded to be for years the tutor of the emperor and his family.

Scarcely a year before his death Charlemagne, now old and feeble, resolved to make his son Louis his colleague in the empire. There was a solemn scene in the grand cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle when the aged emperor publicly declared his resolution and reminded his son of the duties of a good sovereign, bidding him put the crown on his head. After that he retired from public life, living quietly at Aix-la-Chapelle, where he died in 814. His last words were, "Now, Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit."

But, as we have seen, it was not coronation that made Charlemagne emperor of central and southern Europe. He had established his own sway from the German Ocean to the middle of Italy. The papal power was glad to emancipate itself from the old Roman empire, which now had its headquarters in Constantinople, and adopt as its champion this vigorous hero. Charlemagne is the very ideal of the knight of the Middle Ages. He was a great soldier, a

The Hierarchy

great civilizer of barbaric peoples, and, up to his light, a thoroughly religious man. He gave a tremendous impulse to architects and builders, to farmers and planters, to manufacturers and to merchants. He organized an imperial system of education.

Charlemagne was a great missionary. It is true that his method of conversion resembled that of the Mohammedans. He offered an alternative of baptism or the sword; but he honestly and earnestly did the best he could to advance the cause of Christ and civilization, and always enforced baptism was followed by religious education and spiritual oversight. "Apostolic practice was to teach and baptize; Charlemagne's practice was to baptize and teach. Wherever his conquests extended churches, schools, and monasteries were erected, bishoprics were established and endowed; so that, even when the first generation remained heathen at heart while Christian in name, the offspring of Christians by compulsion often became Christians by conviction." He planned, but did not live long enough to realize, the conversion of the Scandinavians.

Charlemagne was the great defender of

The Hierarchy

the Church. He marched against the Norsemen who advanced from the frozen regions; against the Huns, who advanced from the mysterious East; and held the Saracens in check on the South. The influence of Charlemagne on the Church's internal development has been thus defined by Dr. Cowan:

“1. Systematic provision was made by him for the support and education of the clergy. The payment of tithes, originally voluntary, in the sixth century ecclesiastically enjoined, was now legally enforced. He issued decrees dealing with the training and examination of candidates for ordination, addressed epistles to the bishops ordering conformity to those decrees, and encouraged clerical learning by the foundation and enrichment of libraries.

“2. Indirectly he promoted the severance of Western from Eastern Christendom. With the establishment of the new Roman empire dependence of the Roman Church on the old empire ceased; the political link between the Eastern and Western Churches was broken; and thus one main influence preservative of ecclesiastical unity even amid mutual jealousy was removed.

The Hierarchy

“ 3. The policy of Charlemagne led to the growth of papal power and prestige. His father, Pepin, had purchased an alliance with the papacy by enlarging the pope's domain and so strengthening his secular power. Charlemagne continued Pepin's policy on a larger scale. He secured papal recognition and support by further additions to papal territory and by constituting the popedom a temporal sovereignty, subject to the emperor's suzerainty alone. He also magnified and fortified the pope's spiritual supremacy by securing for Rome the allegiance of new churches in freshly conquered regions, and by a general support of Roman ecclesiastical authority, especially in matters of ritual, throughout his dominions. Undesignedly, moreover, through acceptance of the imperial title from papal hands, he allowed a foundation to be laid on which was reared the later papal claim to bestow and to take away kingdoms and crowns.

“ 4. Charlemagne, however, while thus fortifying the papacy both in the temporal and in the spiritual sphere, also laid the foundations of ultimate and antipapal revolt. A general council at Frankfort in

The Hierarchy

786 opposed under his auspices, in the iconoclastic controversy, both Rome and Constantinople. Still more important, in this regard, was the emperor's determined conservation of the lay element in Church government. The Frankish council was composed not, like most other synods, of bishops only, with presbyters and deacons as assessors, but also of counts and barons. The imperial commissioners, moreover, who inspected and regulated ecclesiastical matters, were chosen from both laity and clergy; one third of the imperial legislation dealt with ecclesiastical affairs, and the emperor represented himself as 'the bishops' bishop.' Charlemagne's view of the relation between Church and State was equally theocratic with that of the papacy; only the supreme head of the theocracy he held to be not the pope but the emperor. To the pope he was ready to give ample temporal power as well as spiritual; but for himself he claimed supreme authority, both spiritual and temporal. The pope might be the Aaron, but the emperor was the Moses, of the theocracy. Charlemagne's influence was in fact only accidentally exercised in favor of papal extension; and in

The Hierarchy

as far as he emphasized the lay claim of prince and baron to a share in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs, in so far, even while he strengthened the papacy, he was fostering one of the forces through which papal power, in half of Christendom, was eventually overthrown."

The holy Roman empire did not very long survive its founder. The power of the popes was increased by its formation, and it was also increased by its tumbling in pieces. In 858, for the first time, a pope was crowned, Nicholas I, and during the reign of this pope certain forged documents were made public which fraudulently declared that the popes had received secular authority from Constantine. They now claimed universal spiritual supremacy.

The Hierarchy

V

The Separation of the Eastern and Western Churches

THERE is no indication that images were generally used in worship before the days of Constantine. But when Christianity was raised to the throne it controlled the artists of the world as well as its politicians and soldiers. Sacred statues and pictures were prized, and came to be regarded with reverence. Before a century had passed they were regularly used in worship, both in public and in private. The great men of the Church all had something to say about them—some criticising, some defending their use. By the eighth century Christendom had gone far on the road to idolatry. Incense was burned before holy pictures, scrapings from paintings of our Lord were mixed with the sacramental wine, and already it had been discovered that certain images were able to perform miraculous cures.

What has been called the Iconoclastic

The Hierarchy

Movement—that is, the image-destroying movement—began in the eighth century under Leo the Isaurian, emperor in Constantinople. It would take an entire chapter, and a very long one at that, to describe how this strife, beginning with the emperor's personal disinclination to image worship, was waged fiercely through a century; how the army became "iconoclastic," and assisted in the destruction of consecrated images; how the masses still superstitiously venerated them; how the ablest writers of the day took sides; how insurrections were raised by monks, and formidable rebellions begun; how advocates of both views were murdered by mobs; how monks were banished, tortured, mutilated, and killed; and how, through all this bitter struggle in the East, which centered at Constantinople, the West, which centered at Rome, continued in undisturbed veneration of both images and pictures. The doctrine professed by the Church in Europe was that of Gregory the Great: "Images in churches are lawful as means of instruction and aids to devotion, but not as objects of worship;" but the worshipers in practice went far beyond this. From the outset the popes

The Hierarchy

avored image worship. This important difference of standpoint between the Christians of the East and those of the West was one of several causes of the great schism which in 1054 divided Christendom into the Eastern and Western Churches.

Another controversy in this remote period was that concerning transubstantiation—whether in the holy communion the properties of the body and blood of Christ are miraculously transferred to the bread and wine. This question gave rise to as bitter feelings as ever divided the Church of Christ. The record of the early Church clearly shows that one of the doctrines most precious to it was “the real presence of Christ in the communion, and the real participation of Christ by the communicant.” And the meaning easiest to take from the utterances of many of the early fathers of the Church is that they believed in transubstantiation much as the Roman Catholic Church now teaches it. But the fathers of the Church were, most of them, wonderful rhetoricians, overfond of figures of speech and mystical suggestions. And no very definite conclusion had been reached by the Church till the ninth century, when Rad-

The Hierarchy

bertus, the learned Abbot of Corvey, by his aggressive advocacy of the doctrine, set all the wise people of Europe discussing it.

To modern Protestant minds the doctrine seems absurd. But until the birth of modern science it was universally believed that everything on earth had an *insensible substance*—a substance that cannot be discerned by the senses—quite apart from its form or color or taste; so that it seemed possible for the bread and wine to be *substantially* changed into the body and blood of the Saviour while still retaining the outward show of bread and wine. One of Radbertus's great opponents was Scotus Erigena, who taught that Christ's body was not present in the consecrated bread and wine in any but a symbolic sense. Another opponent was Ratramnus, who taught the doctrine of the spiritual presence—that in the act of "consecration" God imparts a power to the bread and wine which indeed does not change their substance, but which enables true believers partaking of them to spiritually participate in Christ's body and blood. This thoroughly mystical doctrine was in a later century adopted by John Calvin. The controversy broke out again in

✕ The Hierarchy

the eleventh century, and in 1215 transubstantiation was declared by Rome to be an essential article of faith. This long-continued controversy involved the same principles as that concerning image worship, and followed it so closely that we mention it here, although the doctrine of transubstantiation had no great part in the division between the Eastern and Western Churches.

The causes of the ultimate separation grew steadily through the centuries. Racial differences and geographical divisions were at their roots. The great metropolis of the East, Constantinople, was Greek; the great metropolis of the West, Rome, was Latin; each became a priestly capital, and the liturgy of each section was in the language of its rulers. This was of itself a sort of separation. All Christendom was debased by superstitions brought over from heathen times, which had gradually worked themselves into both doctrine and practice; but the superstitions in the one section were characteristically European, in the other Asiatic. Then, too, each section produced at intervals great theologians, and each tended to disparage those of the other section.

Western Christians early adopted the doc-

The Hierarchy

trine that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as well as the Father; this Eastern Christians denied. The Eastern Church regarded it as a sin to eat blood, the Western Church permitted it. The Eastern Church permitted clergymen who had been married before ordination to retain their wives; the Western Church refused it. The Eastern Church claimed for the Patriarch of Constantinople a universal episcopate, which the Pope of Rome denied, and a century or so later the pope made a similar claim, which the patriarch denied. Then the rivalry between the old Eastern Roman empire and the new Western holy Roman empire caused political jealousy and bitterness. Various ecclesiastical questions arose also which added to the bitterness; and finally, about the middle of the eleventh century, the Patriarch of Constantinople formally denounced the errors of the Church of Rome and circulated his manifesto in Italy. The pope by means of his legates circulated an equally irritating document in Constantinople; and the schism between the two Churches became complete (1054). There have been many efforts to unite them, but none have succeeded.

The Hierarchy

VI

A Thousand Years After Christ

CHRISTENDOM settled down to the belief that the world would end in the year 1000. It was a dark time; but it is a good date to stop at a moment and look back. Nearly all Europe was now nominally Christian, two exceptions being the shores of the Baltic and Mohammedan Spain. Scandinavia was converted in the ninth century; Anskar was its apostle. About the same time the Slavs were converted; Methodius was their apostle. Methodius was a painter as well as a preacher, and did wonderful work by an "illustrated sermon"—a picture of the Last Judgment, which he took with him. The Bulgarian court became Christian in 863. The Polish duke married a Christian princess and adopted her religion in 966. The Russian Prince Vladimir sent out an embassy to inquire concerning the religions of the world, being dissatisfied with his own; and, after having received their report, he decided to adopt the Greek form of Chris-

The Hierarchy

tianity; he whipped the idol of the nation, and pitched it headlong into the Dnieper, and compelled the baptism of his entire people, following it with religious instruction (988). In the year 1000 the Duke Stephen of the Magyars (Hungarians we call them) received from the Pope of Rome the title of Apostolic Majesty, because for three years he had been zealously engaged in the establishment of Christianity.

But while the tree of the Gospel was spreading its branches far and wide it seemed to be rotting at its heart. It would be hard to overstate the exaltation of papal power in the ninth century; it would be impossible to express its baseness in the tenth. Three Italian women, of aristocratic blood but infamous morals, controlled the papacy in succession, and through most of the century chose "the Vicegerent of God" from among their lovers and their sons. By bribes an unordained man opened his way to St. Peter's chair and took the whole row of ordinations in one day. A few years later a thoroughly bad boy of twelve, better acquainted with vice than most men of thirty, was made pope. One of the better popes of this century, Sylvester II

The Hierarchy

(999–1003), a man of noble scholarship, said, “The morals of Rome are the horror of the world.” Repeatedly rivals claimed the papal throne, and cursed and fought with each other.

The monasteries of Europe were all along centers of refinement and literary activity; in many cases, also, they were centers of religious power. But their certain steady increase in wealth frequently led to luxury and corruption. And there were frequent attempts made to reform them.

From primitive times the feeling had descended that clergymen should not marry. Many reasons were given in favor of their celibacy, some based on Scripture, some on expediency and experience. But in the debased time of which we now write priests disregarded the law of the Church and took to themselves concubines. From large sections of the Church all wholesome clerical discipline disappeared. The bishops were often among the worst of ministers in their disregard of sacred claims, while the common clergy were ignorant, sottish, and licentious.

The tendency to make pilgrimages to Rome and other holy places increased

The Hierarchy

greatly during the Dark Ages; especially to Jerusalem did hosts of pilgrims journey. The erection of churches, even the gift of small sums of money, were accepted by the clergy as a sort of atonement for repented sins, and thus the doctrine of penance arose. Akin to this was the "mortification of flesh" practiced in monasteries, where good men inflicted on themselves severe physical punishment for the sake of their souls. The grossest superstition was shown everywhere in the veneration of relics. The Virgin Mary was openly worshiped, and Saturday became Mary's day as Sunday was the Lord's day. From the time of which we are writing till the present the liturgy of the Roman Catholic Church has not changed. The Latin language was uniformly used in public service, and the people took little or no part. Organs were built in the great cathedrals. As a rule priests did not preach. Not yet had the peculiar practice of the modern Roman Church arisen, in communion, of giving wafers to the laity and wine only to the priests.

Hildebrand :
the State Controlled by the Church

“ It would have sounded strange in the ears of Nero or of Trajan to be told that a day would come when the rule of Rome could be spoken of as the joint ‘rule of Christ and Cæsar;’ to be told that their successors should be admitted to their office by rites borrowed from the sacred books of the Hebrew, at the hands of the chief of the sect whose votaries they sent to the lions or to the coat of fire. It was in a very deep and living sense that the words were fulfilled which said that the kingdoms of the world had become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.”—PROFESSOR EDWARD A. FREEMAN.

Dapal Supremacy

Hildebrand

TRAVELLING to Rome, Bruno, a cousin of the emperor, having been made pope at the Diet of Worms, had rested at Clugny. There he became interested in the splendid enthusiasms of Hildebrand, prior of the great monastery of Clugny, and, coming fully under his influence, was persuaded to go to Rome as a pilgrim, considering him-

Papal Supremacy

in Italy, and, after a fashion not uncommon among great men, born poor. Educated in Rome, in a monastery over which his uncle presided, he had endeavored, in the strictness and quietude of his life, to starve his thoughts into submission and sponge his mind of doubt. In the mysticism of the spirit had departed the virility of the flesh, and in the first fervors of the calling which he had adopted the celibacy of the priesthood of the mother Church had seemed to him obligatory upon all who devoted their energies to Christ. Choked with the moral sulphur of the times, he had desired to purify the Church, organizing the various forces latent in her, culminating them in a power which should contain in essence the united responsibilities of Church and State. Later in life he entered the monastery of Clugny, in France, where for many years he lived in close communion of thought with those who had forsaken the ceremonies of the world, seeking God in contemplation of higher things, striving for the attainment of the true serenity and peace. Removed from the fret and worry of life, the monastery was absolute escapement from all outward influences; and in the sanctity

Papal Supremacy

of its cloisters, in which the grandeur and sublimity of his thoughts had arisen to the loftiest heights, nothing had varied the calm lakelike impassibility of Hildebrand's existence.

Such was his portrait. At that hour when Leo IX offered to him the position of assistant Hildebrand retired into solitude, and during a period of reflection went forward and into the past. He reviewed the negligent years, he interrogated the future. Behind him were bundles of baseless appearances, the mysticism which had shrouded his youth, the theories into which his aspirations had led him; but now Rome lay at his feet; beyond were the insignia of the papacy, while in him pulsed that strength which brings the strophium to the conqueror. For a moment he stood face to face with, and looked into the eyes of, the Church: the dome of Saint Peter's, a solitary pope, cardinals, bishops, priests! wonderful symbolization of man's lust of eternal life! There came to him visions of larger existence, of newer horizons, and of fresher circumstances; he was at last to have opportunity to carry out his ideals. And as in judicious deliberation he questioned

Papal Supremacy

the personage that was himself, anyone who had chanced that way would have discerned not a man but an aim.

Hildebrand was now in his thirty-fifth year. His success at Rome was immediate, and his influence, sagaciously exercised, became soon a force in the purification of the Church, the cleansing of which required not spirituality of metaphor, but rather aggressiveness of action. With the establishment of his power he endeavored to enforce the law of celibacy among the priests, to stop the actual or virtual sale of religious offices, and to reform the degenerate condition of the people. During the six years of Leo's pontificate the emaciated prior was the real ruler of the Church, the pope effacing himself behind the great figure of his tried confidant and wise and incorruptible counselor, closely reflecting Hildebrand's ideas, obediently and unreservedly seconding his plans. Rarely has there been in religious history a collaboration so useful and far-reaching in its results. At the death of Leo IX, in 1054, Hildebrand selected, as successor of the pope, Gebhardt, Bishop of Eichstadt, a German prelate eminent in affairs eccle-

Papal Supremacy

siastical, and the intimate adviser of Henry III. Upon his accession to the papacy Gebhardt took the name of Victor II, holding office until 1057, and being followed in the next sixteen years by Popes Stephen IX (1057-1058), Nicholas II (1058-1061), and Alexander II (1061-1073).

In this period, a new and glorious epoch in religious history, the Holy See regained much of its former influence over the temporal affairs of the world, and became the most progressive of institutions. Under Hildebrand's auspices the Church was re-founded, the purity of the priesthood made possible, and the pretensions of the papacy promoted and established. Believing the dignity of the pope to be above that of the emperor, Hildebrand, in company with his friend, Cardinal Peter Damiani, began a moral revolution, succeeding in removing the papacy's dependence upon the State. Meanwhile, the chief factor in these triumphs, who had undertaken ecclesiastical and administrative tasks of remarkable difficulty, filled in turn the various offices of cardinal-deacon, cardinal-archdeacon, legate to France, and Chancellor of the Holy See. The latter position was next in rank to the

Papal Supremacy

papacy itself. Presently Hildebrand, having for twenty-five years appointed the successors of Peter, was himself to become occupant of the holy chair. On April 22, 1073, the funeral services of Alexander II conducted by Hildebrand were interrupted by cries that signified that he was the choice of the people for pope.

“Ye know well, brethren,” a cardinal exclaimed, “that since the days of Leo this tried and prudent archdeacon has exalted the Roman See, and delivered this city from many perils. Wherefore we, the bishops and cardinals, elect him now, with one mind, as the pastor and bishop of your souls.” Amid shouts that it was “the will of Saint Peter, Hildebrand is pope,” were brought forth the scarlet robe and the papal crown. Apparently reluctant, Hildebrand ascended the throne, being styled Gregory VII, and accepted the responsibilities of the sacred office, the conduct of which was to win for him the renown of being the most enlightened, sagacious, and successful of popes. Popular and acclaimed, caring the while little for pomp and less for popularity, he thus approached with hesitation a problem so deep and serious as the government

Papal Supremacy

of the supreme power. Aware of the difficulty and danger of his situation, he attempted to prepare the way by his innovations for a wholly reformed and perfect Church. A rigid disciplinarian, he ruled adroitly with a high hand; sincere in his efforts to secure papal absolutism and ecclesiastical and religious reform, he was ever an earnest and conscientious pope. In the prosecution of his policy he was often excessively aggressive and inordinate; yet to argue with him would have been no more profitable than to chide a swollen stream.

His success as a pope and the leading spirit in the conversion of Church and State soon made him enemies, and brought down upon him a storm of bitter diplomatic conflict and savage partisan abuse and hatred. Henry IV, the young son of the late emperor, insolent in his extreme youth, impetuous in his inexperience, ill-advised and prompted by the foes of Hildebrand, questioned the severity and disputed the supremacy of the papal cause. Bishops and clergy in general rebelled against the drastic methods by which he strove to achieve a cessation of priestly marriages and sale of offices. The causes for dissent

Papal Supremacy

were many and the dissenters numerous. Intrigues, fathered by envious passions and wild hopes, assailed him in his endeavors to remove the traces of unfaithful ministry and loose discipline. Fighting strenuously with the most corrupt tools obtainable, into his path they rolled their bowlders of fierce opposition, but like a torrent his unceasing energy passed over their attempts, vain in their very futility. They were strangely mistaken when they trusted that resistance or obstacles would make him retreat. His will did not bend; it stood upright, vivified, as if supported by an unyielding thought, an irresistible sentiment. The more he was attacked in the duties of his office, the more inflexible he was in his perseverance and knightly service. To all those who wished to fight against the Church, he said, "You cannot pass here." Upon him intrigues had no effect; he made of his beliefs a great bronze breastplate upon which were shivered the lances of his enemies.

Such things show the trend of a temperament, though not, perhaps, its force. Presently the latter was displayed. In matters of patronage and investiture Henry IV had

Papal Supremacy

acted for years in utter disregard of papal authority. He was a vacillating, cowardly king; an emperor in everything but dignity, a prince in everything but grace; a superstitious braggart afraid of nothing but danger. For his acts of gross disobedience and reckless disposal of benefices he had been summoned to Rome, under threat of excommunication, to appear before an ecclesiastical tribunal to be held on February 22, 1076. In reply to this Henry at a hastily gathered council deposed Hildebrand from the papacy, and delivered a message to "Hildebrand, no longer pope, but a false monk," in which he denied the latter's power, closing with the words: "Let another ascend the chair of Peter, who will not cloak violence with religion; . . . for I, Henry, king by the grace of God, with all my bishops, say unto you, Get down! get down!" Hildebrand answered by excommunicating Henry and his subservient bishops, and by releasing formally his subjects from allegiance: "I absolve all Christians from the oaths they have sworn or may swear to him; and forbid all obedience to him as king. I bind him in the bonds of this anathema; that all the nations may

Papal Supremacy

know and acknowledge that thou art Peter, that upon thy rock the Son of the living God has built his Church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Henry soon wanted for sympathy. One by one his followers abandoned the stormy king who had chosen to brave the pope. Suddenly he found himself alone. As the influence of Hildebrand's anathema increased in its moral effect he thought of rebellion; there was no one that would aid him. He called to his subjects; they would not hear. Through the immensity of his kingdom he searched for one friend. Then terror seized him. Fearing entire loss of the empire, he sought to obtain a reconciliation with the pope. In the hope of propitiating Hildebrand Henry crossed the Mount Cenis pass to Canossa, where the venerable pontiff had retired to the fortress of a friend. In all the weather's harshness, accompanied but by a few attendants, his child, and his wife, who in her solicitude and unwavering allegiance had clung to him, the deposed emperor journeyed to make his peace with the Church. Arriving at the castle on January 24, 1077, Henry received the papal command to await for a

Papal Supremacy

space within the inner and outer walls. In the air's sharpness Henry stood for three days a penitent, trembling in intense mental agitation on the very verge of the fearful abyss of excommunication. Finally admitted to the presence of the gray and shriveled ruler of the Church, his menacing eyes fixed upon him, the outwardly humble king knelt for pardon. He received, not forgiveness alone, but, so subtly that it was the more humiliating, in his absolute contempt for princely power Hildebrand did not merely forgive—he disdained to punish.

The reconciliation, however, proved to be but temporary. The dramatic scene at Canossa had been the climax of Hildebrand's success; the power of the papacy had reached its apogee. The world had been watching a crescendo that had mounted with the years. Its culmination was in the episode with Henry IV. But the tension had been too great, something snapped; Hildebrand's influence, visibly, took flight. The times were again noisy with dissension and riot; the restored but humiliated king met with widespread and effective sympathy. In the past, possessed by those almost miraculous flashes of imagination and deci-

Papal Supremacy

sion that characterized him, Hildebrand had sent his enemies spinning like leaves which the vagrant wind has caught and torn. He had planned one moment and executed the next; a phantom in a ballad was not swifter than he. Now he began to cease to enjoy full freedom of action; the ambitions and interests long held in check united to overthrow the dominion of Rome, denouncing and combating the papacy.

To be master in one's own house is the first requisite of any organizer; to carry out the duties of an apostolic office, independence and power are needed. But despite the loss of temporal sovereignty, unconscious of the height of the world's barriers, and of the consequent futility of his own endeavors, this sturdy ecclesiastic, trusting in God, strove persistently to continue his unifying work. Henry, absolved and forgiven, broke his promises; excommunicated a second time, he successfully defied the pope. Rudolph of Suabia, a rival German king, whose claims Hildebrand recognized, was killed in battle; and Henry, marching to Rome, was crowned by Clement III, an antipope appointed by the emperor. Hildebrand's popularity had gone as popularity

Papal Supremacy

ever goes; the people had tired, seemingly, of his methods of action, his beliefs, and himself. Conscious of his partial failure to be the ideal reformer, as he wished to be, he saw that his safety lay only in retreat. It was time to go, and his Norman ally, Duke Robert Guiscard, intervening, Hildebrand was rescued from the troops of Henry IV. Hastening to Salerno, in the south of Italy, for several years he lived meditatively in the sunset of his life. On May 25, 1085, seventy-two years old, he died, on his deathbed absolving and blessing all those who still believed in him, "except Henry the emperor, the antipope, and their adherents," his last words being, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile."

Fancy a peak piercing the heavens, shadowing the earth. It was on such a peak as that Hildebrand stood as pope, a precipice on either side. Did he look below, a vertigo arose to meet him; from above, delirium came; while the horizon, though it bounded the limits of vision, could not mark the frontiers of his dreams. In addition there was the exaltation that altitudes produce. The valleys have their chieftains; it is

Papal Supremacy

from mountains that conquerors and leaders come. Hildebrand was both, sceptered at that; and with what a scepter! One that upheld the spiritual dignity of the papacy, denying the supremacy of the empire, and restraining princely despotism; one that infused into the discredited and decayed Church a more pure and earnest spirit, maintaining its institutions, and restoring its magnificence; one that represented religious enthusiasm perfected, consummated, and almost deified. To wield such a scepter securely requires grace no doubt, majesty too, but certainly strength; the latter Hildebrand possessed, but it was the feverish strength of one who had fathomed the unfathomable, and who sought to make its depths his own.

Face to face with the numerous enemies of the Church, he had failed to make entirely successful the reforms he inaugurated, which filled his great, strong brain, and which he had conceived in the studious and fruitful solitude of Clugny. In reading the records of Hildebrand's period one sees the struggles and the opposition of interests against which he had to contend from the day when he provided the Church with that

Papal Supremacy

organization whose wonderful action, effective energy, and latest splendor are still observable. Kings, antipopes, cardinals, prelates, priests, laymen, ambassadors, political factions, all persons of importance, all selfish and vested interests, were in alliance against the moral revolution brought about by the most remarkable character in the long line of popes, with whose name are connected indissolubly many of the glorious episodes in religious history. He possessed that eternal spirit of devotion, enthusiasm, and aspiration which in each generation incarnates itself in one heroic soul. His beliefs guided his life; he planned, fought, and suffered because of them; and when he died, never so powerfully alive as then, reigning as never before, the humble monk of Clugny was not merely a vigorous priest, a sagacious ecclesiastic, an eminent pope—he was a symbol!

Papal Supremacy

II

The Story of the Crusades

CHRISTIAN pilgrims to Jerusalem continued to be maltreated by Mohammedans, and all Europe was indignant. As early as 1000 Sylvester II made an appeal to the princes of Christendom to redeem Jerusalem from the sway of the infidel; but his early death stopped a movement that had great promise. In Hildebrand's day the Turks had conquered the Saracens, and atrocities on Christians were multiplied. In Hildebrand's own words, "They were daily killed like cattle;" and the most trusty records show that this was not an exaggeration. But, as we have seen, Hildebrand had other foes to fight before he could reach the Mohammedans; and he, too, died before the Crusades were begun.

Urban II, Hildebrand's successor, was only less able than Hildebrand himself. He skillfully managed political affairs in Italy and France, and, thoroughly understanding the times, put himself at the head

Papal Supremacy

of the First Crusade. He sent Peter the Hermit through northern Italy and France to enlist the common people. This strange personality combined lofty enthusiasm with low life, and the immediate result of his appeals was the gathering of nearly fifty thousand men from the lowest classes into a traveling mob, rather than an army, for he was unable to organize them; and eventually he led them directly to ruin. But Urban did not depend on Peter only. He wrote letters to the leaders of Christendom, traveled far and wide, made appeals to the synods of the Church, and thoroughly aroused the religious zeal of the West. He assembled a great council at Claremont (1095). Hundreds of dignitaries, clerical and lay, attended, besides thousands of lower rank. The pope's speech was one of marvelous eloquence. At its close with one voice the great throng cried out, "God wills it!" "You have stained your weapons by mutual slaughter," he responded; "O Christians, for whom Christ died, will you not count it joy to die for him?" "God wills it!" they shouted again. And the phrase became the war cry of the Crusaders. All who enlisted made this enlistment

Papal Supremacy

known by attaching to their clothing a red cross, and so came to be called Crusaders. Thus was started a movement unlike anything else in history.

There was hardly a passion of the human heart to which the pope did not appeal. No matter what your sins had been, they were forgiven if you became a Crusader; no matter how good was your fortune in this world, you inherited greater blessedness in heaven if for Christ's sake you died on the field of battle; but if you survived, then you were sure of knightly honors. Then, too, all the wonderful East lay before these adventurers, with unbounded hopes of wealth and glory. Urban died in the summer of 1099, and in the same summer Jerusalem was captured by the Crusaders.

It is cold work nowadays to analyze the motives of this movement. Doubtless the far-sighted Urban saw that it would unite Christendom around him, and overthrow the antipope. Doubtless he hoped by means of alliance against a common enemy to reunite Eastern and Western Christendom. Doubtless his successors saw that by the Crusades papal supremacy was being notably enhanced. Cathedrals and monas-

Papal Supremacy

teries rapidly became wealthy; for nobles and knights, poor in money but rich in land, were forced to sell their estates to buy weapons and to hire soldiers; and the Church was the only purchaser. Then, too, it was to the interest of every sovereign in Europe and of every merchant to assist; and hardworked serfs, and worldly-minded monks, and hopeless debtors, and fettered criminals found prompt relief from the penalties of their several sad positions by enlistment.

The First Crusade. Godfrey of Bouillon led the first expedition (1096) with consummate ability, and, capturing Jerusalem in 1099, made it the capital of a kingdom with very nearly the boundaries of Solomon's. A noble man was Godfrey, thoroughly godly and thoroughly human; when they made him king he would not wear a crown of gold in a town where his Saviour had worn a crown of thorns.

The Second Crusade. Besides this kingdom of Jerusalem two other Christian principalities were established by the First Crusade: one at Edessa and the other at Antioch. Not a century passed before Edessa was recaptured by the Turks, and Jerusa-

Papal Supremacy

lem was seriously threatened. So Pope Eugenius inaugurated the Second Crusade, of which Bernard of Clairvaux became the apostle. The emperor and the King of France assisted. But the expedition was badly managed, and exceedingly unfortunate. A few years later Saladin, a hero of Mohammedanism, recaptured Jerusalem.

The Third Crusade (1189) was led by the Emperor Barbarossa, Philip of France, and Richard the Lion-hearted of England. The blow which this Crusade might have struck against Mohammedanism would have been nearly fatal but for jealousies between the English and French monarchs. The expedition resulted only in a treaty securing the right of Christians to visit the holy places without interference of any sort.

The Fourth Crusade (1215). Pope Innocent III originated the Fourth Crusade for the purpose of reëstablishing a Christian kingdom in Jerusalem; and appointed a strange adventurer, Baldwin of Flanders, to be its leader. But Baldwin found excuses for marching to Constantinople, took part in a quarrel about the proper heir to the imperial throne, and settled it (astonishing to relate!) by sitting down upon that throne

Papal Supremacy

himself, and establishing a Latin empire in the very center of Greek power—an empire which lasted for fifty years. His desertion of the holy cause was a great sin in the eyes of the European masses; but Baldwin tried to put all priests and bishops in his empire under control of the Pope of Rome; and this sudden enlargement of the Western Church at the expense of the Eastern served to condone his sin.

The Fifth Crusade (1228). The Emperor Frederick II vowed to redeem the sepulcher of Christ; but he delayed so long that the pope excommunicated him. He then resolved, without waiting for forgiveness, to start. Comparatively few joined him. On reaching Palestine he found the Mohammedans had other enemies than himself to fight, and so, with masterly statecraft, he secured the surrender of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Joppa. But when he returned to Europe it was to receive an extra curse from the pope for having undertaken such a deed while under the papal ban, and also for making any compromise with an infidel. Twenty years after this (1248) Jerusalem was captured by the Turks.

The Sixth and Seventh Crusades were

Papal Supremacy

organized by Saint Louis of France, the godliest of kings, of whom Voltaire wrote, "It is not given to man to carry virtue further." In the Sixth Crusade he was captured (1249). In the Seventh he died (1270) of an infectious disease, at Tunis. His last words were, "I will enter thy house, O Lord; I will worship within thy sanctuary."

With the death of Saint Louis the crusading spirit slowly ebbed away. The states of Europe could no longer be made to act as a unit. But there was a deeper reason than this. Mohammedan civilization and commerce were now at their height; the spirit which animates modern trade was already born; and it proved better, on both sides, to trade than to kill. So the intensity of hatred between Christian and Moslem was gradually lessened.

Books and books have been written upon the effects of the Crusades. It is true that they were unsuccessful in their endeavors to permanently establish a Christian principality in the Moslem East. But it must not be supposed that even as military expeditions they were failures. The Crusaders fought with far greater success than they

Papal Supremacy

ever knew. Looking back from the nineteenth century, we see that Christianity was in real danger from Moslem aggression during the Middle Ages. Wherever Saracens and Turks advanced Christianity was wiped out; and, humanly speaking, every sword-thrust of Christian armies was needed to perpetuate the mere existence of the Church on earth.

The Crusades had a very direct and a very involved effect on the Church itself. In the first place, they made it immeasurably wealthy; and increase of wealth is increase of power. Not only were great estates purchased at prices of poverty, but very many of the choicest domains in Europe were bequeathed to the Church by Crusaders who never returned, and for the rest of whose souls the enriched priests were ready to say masses. The absence of so many nobles made the ecclesiastics relatively more powerful, and in a sense ennobled them. There was not an archiepiscopate or diocese, hardly a parish, in all Europe in whose confines the Church was not enriched by the successive Crusades. Most of all was the importance and wealth of the popes increased. A special tax, the

Papal Supremacy

Saladin tithe, levied for the recovery of Jerusalem, became a permanent source of papal income. Special taxes were imposed for Crusades that never took place. Greater than all other benefits to the papacy, probably, was the political greatness that came from command of all secular forces. The pope had become in deed and in truth the head of Christendom.

But the Crusades furnished one of the directest means, also, for ultimately lessening the power of the papacy and Church. With wealth came luxury and corruption. The unlimited power which had come to the popes was naturally regarded by them as illimitable; but they reached its limits sooner than any could have dreamed of. Their assumption and abuses increased until at length, after many less effective resentments, Luther came.

Perhaps the farthest-reaching of all results of the Crusades was the intellectual revival—the birth of the disposition to inquire. Rubbing up against the polished Greek and the luxurious Arab, the European knight got fresh ideas from the East, and when he returned he was not so ready to unquestioningly accept the commands of

Papal Supremacy

priests and bishops. He had begun to think for himself. Up to the twelfth century Western Christians had hardly dared to inquire concerning Church doctrines or practices.

The newborn spirit of inquiry and unrest led to the formation of two most singular sects of heretics, very important in Church history for three reasons: as in some sense the pioneers of the Reformation; as the immediate cause of the origin of the infamous Inquisition; and as the object of Crusades within Christendom, the record of which fill some of the ghastliest of historic pages.

The Albigenses early made their headquarters in Albi (in Languedoc). They called themselves Puritans, but they were not very pure, either in doctrine or life. They spread all over southern Europe. They taught that the Bible was the only rule of faith, and rejected the Romish doctrines of transubstantiation, purgatory, masses for the dead, adoration of images, and invocation of saints. Like certain ancient heretics, they taught that all physical nature came from the devil, and by a rough sort of logic reasoned that the Old Testa-

Papal Supremacy

ment was inspired by Satan. They taught that Jesus was not a real man, and that the only baptism incumbent upon Christians was the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Those accounted most holy among them were prohibited from marrying, from eating flesh, and from holding property.

It gives us new conceptions of political and social conditions in the Middle Ages to read that a great convention of these sects was held in Toulouse in 1167. But twelve years later they were anathematized at Rome, and tremendous efforts were made to suppress them. First, French and Spanish missionaries earnestly sought to convert them to the true faith. Then, in 1208, a "Crusade" swept thousands of them out of life. They were murdered with every refinement of cruelty, and their property confiscated. Then the infamous Inquisition was instituted (1229), with "its secret espionage, ensnaring examination, inhuman torture, and travesty of trial," to complete the work of extermination.

Another sect which originated in hostility to the mediæval priesthood was that of the Waldenses. "In 1170 Waldo, a merchant of Lyons, was deeply impressed by the sud-

Papal Supremacy

den death of a friend. He asked a priest the surest road to heaven. The priest replied in the words of Christ, 'If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.' Waldo heard and obeyed; he did more. He wished to read Scripture for himself, and employed two ecclesiastics to translate the gospels into the Romance tongue." He understood that he and every other layman were called to preach the Gospel; he loathed the luxury of the chiefs of the Church. So he founded the society of "Poor Men of Lyons," who, clad in coarse clothing and wearing wooden shoes, and with the gospels in their hands, preached all around Lyons repentance and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

In 1177 the Archbishop of Lyons forbade the "Poor Men" to preach in public, and when they disobeyed excommunicated them. Waldo appealed to the pope. He was received with friendliness, and his vow of poverty was approved, but his "Poor Men" were adjudged to be incompetent from ignorance to preach the Gospel. Waldo and his friends, firm in their conviction that they were called to preach, left the Church.

Papal Supremacy

In 1183 a synod held at Verona anathematized them. Twenty-three years later Pope Innocent III tried to win back the Waldenses. His conciliatory overtures succeeded with some, whom he constituted into an order of "Catholic Poor," with permission to preach under episcopal supervision.

But the Waldenses continued to grow as a separate sect. Before 1200 they had spread over Italy, Spain, Germany, and France. By 1300 they flourished in Austria, Hungary, Poland, Bohemia, Saxony, and the Netherlands. In 1210 the Bishop of Turin sought authority to suppress "these tare-sowing heretics," who then thronged the Alpine valleys of Piedmont. The causes of their success are very fairly given by their adversaries: "Ignorance, laxity of life, and neglect of duty on the part of the priests; Bible knowledge, pure morals, and unwearied zeal on the part of the heretics. They entered leper houses, swam rivers, disguised themselves as peddlers, faced all sorts of dangers to spread abroad the truths of the Bible. "While other sectaries repel by blasphemy," wrote a Catholic of the thirteenth century, "the Waldenses maintain a great appearance of piety."

Papal Supremacy

“ Before their secession the Waldenses had not greatly departed from Roman dogma; after the schism the divergence gradually widened, and in the thirteenth century their creed anticipated a large portion of the Reformed faith. They maintained the supreme authority of Scripture, and the right of private interpretation. They disowned papal authority, and emphasized the universal priesthood of believers. They rejected purgatory, masses for the dead, invocation of Virgin and saints, extreme unction, and transubstantiation. They abjured indulgences, but retained confession, penance, and absolution.” Their influence kindled among the people a desire to read the Bible.

Intolerance of the Waldenses steadily deepened into persecution. From 1233 imprisonment, torture, and the stake continued to be inflicted on them, supplemented by occasional “Crusades” (1332 and 1488); they became greatly diminished in numbers, and at length hardly existed beyond the romantic Alpine valleys which their awful sufferings have made pathetically famous. As late as 1655 occurred a terrible massacre of six thousand valley people,

Papal Supremacy

which aroused Cromwell's wrath and inspired Milton's famous sonnet:

“Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold ;
Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
When all our fathers worshiped stocks and stones,
Forget not: in thy book record their groans
Who were thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese, that rolled
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyred blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway
The triple Tyrant ; that from these may grow
A hundredfold, who, having learned thy way,
Early may fly the Babylonian woe.”

Their last great persecution was in 1686. Their influence in preparing a soil for future seeds of reforming influence was beyond measurement. They are now known throughout Italy as a prosperous Protestant sect.

Papal Supremacy

III

The Beggar Monks, and the Grandfathers of Science

THE summit of papal power was reached under Innocent III (1198-1216), who in his inaugural sermon declared, "The successor of Saint Peter stands midway between God and man; below God, above man; Judge of all, judged of none." "Not only the whole Church, but the whole world, has been committed to the pope," he wrote; "mine is the right to finally dispose all crowns." Innocent was only thirty-seven when he became pope.

The times favored his claims, and he proceeded with singular ability to make them good. His influence enthroned Otho of Brunswick as emperor, and when that prince forgot that he wore his crown "by the grace of God and the apostolic see" the pope drove him from the throne. When King Philip Augustus of France wickedly divorced his queen Innocent deprived him and his entire kingdom of all religious rites

Papal Supremacy

till he submitted. He excommunicated King John of England, and would not absolve him till he acknowledged the pope as his overlord and promised an annual tribute to Rome. Homage was paid to Innocent by the Princes of Aragon, Hungary, Bulgaria, and others—some of them within the boundaries of the Eastern Church. When Baldwin of Flanders established his Latin empire in Constantinople he passed over to the jurisdiction of Innocent the patriarchs and bishops of that dominion; so that in scope as well as in power the papal government was now greatly increased.

The general Council of Rome (1215) made evident the transcendent power of the pope. Eastern patriarchs and Western archbishops sat side by side to advise the sovereign pontiff, but all questions were decided by the pope himself, and in his name the decrees of the council were issued. Among these decrees was one which made confession to a priest indispensable to Christian life.

But the most important outcome of Pope Innocent's reign—though he could hardly have so estimated it—was the founding of the orders of “Beggar Monks.”

Francis of Assisi came to Rome in the

Papal Supremacy

summer of 1209, with a wonderful scheme tucked behind his wrinkled brow. He was only twenty-seven, but ill health and holy vigils had made him look much older. His pale, thin face was irradiated by pure aspirations and exalted visions. He was dressed like a beggar, for he had "made Poverty his bride." The plan he proposed to the pope was to form a brotherhood of beggar preachers, who should arouse Christians to holier life, and convert the heathen world. Here is a providential antidote, thought the pope, to the Poor Men of Lyons! So he gave Francis his blessing, and the Order of Gray Friars (Franciscans) was begun.

In 1215 the Order of Black Friars (popularly called Dominicans, after their founder) was sanctioned by Innocent to preach scriptural truth and convert heretics; and five years later they also became mendicants. Dominic, their founder, was a Spaniard by birth, intellectual, self-sacrificing, intense, master of the best learning of his day. Ten years before his order was founded he had gone to France to convert the Albigenses, and burned with indignation as he watched the self-indulgence of the priests in whose spiritual charge these heretics were. "Go

Papal Supremacy

barefoot and purseless like the apostles," he exclaimed. "The best way to undo the work of these false teachers is to outlabor and outfast them." His conduct was consistent with this advice.

The mendicants, like the earlier orders, took vows of chastity, obedience, and poverty, refusing to hold property of any sort. They did not retire from society like the earlier orders, but moved among men, constantly seeking to arouse them to the claims of religion. The Dominicans, whose chief aim was to counteract heresy, at once took high rank as preachers, and greatly influenced the thoughtful classes. The Franciscans, emotional like their founder, and recruited at first from among less scholarly men, appealed to the common people. Their sermons were "more practical" than those of the Dominicans. Before long two other mendicant orders were founded, the Carmelites and the Augustinians.

All the orders of Beggar Monks won popular favor, and, being patronized by the pope, increased rapidly. The greatest missionaries, and many of the greatest theologians, of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were mendicant monks. When

Papal Supremacy

the Black Death, a mysterious and revolting disease, scourged Europe (1347-1348) the Franciscans especially counted not their lives dear unto them in their Christlike efforts to lessen the sufferings of the deserted victims of the plague. But, as in all religious organizations, moral degeneracy came at length. Mendicancy, preaching, the confessional, and other direct means of their earlier usefulness became the means of their corruption and downfall. The infamous Inquisition passed into the hands of the Dominicans, while the other Friars gradually became more degraded than priests or monks had ever been before.

By the Grandfathers of Science, mentioned in our chapter head, we mean the Schoolmen—a class of scholars who in the Middle Ages upheld the love of learning, and made as much advancement as could be made amid their hampering environments. True science was then unknown; but while we cannot credit them with originating scientific methods they certainly opened the way for the men who did; and if not the fathers of modern science they were at least its grandfathers. Learning in the Middle Ages was all directed to defense of

Papal Supremacy

the Church's creed against skepticism and heresy. The Schoolmen sought to "fortify old truth with fresh bulwarks of logic and philosophy."

We have room for no more than the mention of the names of a few of the more famous Schoolmen, such as Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose motto was, "Believe in order to understand," and who would have all reasoning start from reverent faith; Abelard, of Nantes, who reversed Anselm's watchword, and said, "Understand before you believe;" and Bernard, Abelard's strong opponent, who said, "Knowledge of the divine is a fruit of devotion rather than of disputation; we know God only so far as we love God." The noble discussion was leisurely carried on during the twelfth century by Hugo Saint Victor of Paris, Hales, an English Franciscan, and Albert the Great, a German Dominican. But the greatest of all Schoolmen were Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas, who were together made doctors in Paris in 1257, were warm friends throughout their lives, and died in the same year, 1274.

Bonaventura became head of the Franciscan order. He taught that "the heart

THE SCOTTS

make the Frenchman asked whence his learning came. He pointed to a crucifix. He was the author of a phrase popular in modern France: "sweetness and light," and possessed these qualities in his own beautiful person.

Thomas Aquinas was even greater than Bonaventure. He was, as he in his youth had been, a schoolmaster. Like him he "dumbed" his literary work. *The Sum of All Arts* became the common authority for the teachers of the Catholic Church. At the time of Trent it lay on the table beside the Bible, and Pope Leo XIII has called it "the treasury of solemn truth."

Like Bonaventure, Aquinas was as learned as he was learned. Over every perplexing question it was his habit to give an answer. He was, however, a man of his times, and approved of persecution and the indulgence system, and enthusiastically believed in papal infallibility.

John Scotus, a Franciscan, should also be mentioned. He differed in many of his conclusions from Thomas Aquinas, and in the thirteenth century the world of scholars was divided between "Thomists" and "Scotists."

Papal Supremacy

IV

The Babylonish Captivity, and the Morning Star of the Reformation

By the end of the fourteenth century it had come to pass that many of the tools and weapons which had been used in constructing and in defending the hierarchy—the government of Christendom by priests—were beginning to be used for its demolition. “It was an era of decay—conspicuous for papal humiliation and eventual infamy, for the corruption of the new and better religious orders, and for a growing alienation of culture, intelligence, and piety from the Catholic Church. It was an era also of preparation—when Wyclif, Hus, and Savonarola labored and suffered, when reforming councils paved the way for more thorough reformation, and when, at length, awakened inquiry and diffused knowledge brought to a crisis the revolt against Rome.”

In 1303 there was a serious rupture between Pope Boniface VIII and King Philip the Fair of France. Boniface, like Hilde-

Papal Supremacy

brand and the great Innocent, held that all kingdoms and kings were rightfully in subjection to the pope. But times had changed since such a doctrine could be carried out. Boniface appointed a day on which to formally depose Philip. On the day before it, however, he was seized by Philip's soldiers and thrown into prison. The next thing to do was to fill the College of Cardinals with Frenchmen, so that a new pope subservient to Philip could be elected. With the election of Clement V (1305), and the enforced removal of the papal court from Rome to Avignon, the "Babylonish captivity" began.

By the French king's influence the weak-willed Clement wickedly suppressed (1311) the Knights Templars, an order which in its day had done noble defensive work for Christendom. But Philip coveted their immense wealth; with fearful cruelty they were destroyed, on absurd charges of immorality, and their property taken by the French crown.

In every part of Europe the pope's prestige now waned. Even his excommunications were disregarded. In Venice one of his nuncios was stoned. In Germany the

Papal Supremacy

emperor repudiated a papal bull of confirmation. In England Edward III expelled the papal legates. Literary men of all nations expressed their contempt for the hierarchy. Petrarch, for example, calls one pope a drunkard, another a profligate, and a third a fool.

Popes and bishops, however, did not see how great was the rising storm. The luxury of their courts must be maintained, so their rapacity was increased. The pope seized the property of all deceased prelates, took one half of the income of the first year of every new bishop and all the revenue of every vacant see, and everywhere exacted enormous fees for papal confirmation of appointments.

In 1377 the papal court returned to Rome. In 1378 Urban VI (an Italian) was chosen to be pope. A little later the French cardinals declared that they had been frightened into voting for Urban by Roman threats, and proceeded to elect another pope, Clement VII, whose court was held in Avignon. The princes and ecclesiastics of Lorraine, Spain, and Scotland, as well as those of France, supported Clement; but Urban was acknowledged by Germany,

Papal Supremacy

England, Poland, and Scandinavia, as well as by Italy. Thus the captivity ended in schism.

John Wyclif, a Yorkshireman and an Oxford graduate (1324-1384), has been called the Morning Star of the Reformation. He became an ideal parish priest, "rich of holy thought and work." His earliest fame was as an expositor of the Scriptures. He stood stoutly against what seemed to him to be encroachment and extortion by Innocent III. Licentious monks, worldly priests, luxurious bishops, and foreign clergymen who had been given fat livings in England, all came under his anathema; but these were only ecclesiastical abuses. He had reached the age of fifty-four before he made any serious protest against the ritual or doctrine of the Church. The bitter actions of the rival popes led him to reconsider the whole subject of the papacy; and his conclusions astounded the Church. He denied the pope's claim to either "spiritual supremacy" or "temporal dominion;" repudiated the "order" of the episcopacy; declared that the Church of Christ had been "Judaized;" rejected the invocation of saints; denied priestly absolution; and rejected transubstantiation.

Papal Supremacy

Long steps, these, toward Protestantism; nevertheless, his doctrines were far behind those of Luther and Calvin.

Wyclif's greatest work was the translation of the Bible into English. He organized a body of itinerant preachers—"Poor Priests" he called them, though many of them were laymen—who imitated the Poor Men of Lyons and the early Franciscans in arousing interest in religious things. They lived on alms. Their supporters were called Lollards.

Wyclif was steadily and bitterly antagonized. His writings were condemned by an ecclesiastical convention and by the House of Lords (1382), and his followers were persecuted and exiled. But John of Gaunt and other powerful noblemen supported him, and until his death he continued to superintend his "Poor Priests" and to preach and write against corrupt doctrine. His influence in England was wide and deep and lasting. John Hus, of Bohemia, declared that his eyes had been opened by Wyclif's writings.

The Council of Constance (1414-1418) was called to end the papal schism, to promote reform, and to check heresy. John

Papal Supremacy

Hus (1369-1415) and Jerome of Prague had reformed the religion of the masses in Bohemia by preaching doctrines which resembled those of Wyclif, and the pope had excommunicated them. Hus had appealed from the pope to the council. The council brought nearly fifty thousand visitors to Constance. All the rival popes were deposed, and, by a conclave nominated by the council, Martin V was elected. The decrees of the council were declared to be binding even on the pope. A program of noble reforms in practice was drawn up. But the doctrines of the reformers were severely dealt with, and John Hus, who had come on the emperor's pledge for his safety, was tried for heresy and condemned to the stake. When the fatal fires were kindled around him he exclaimed, "Lord Jesus, for thy sake I endure this cruel death; I beseech thee to pardon my enemies." One year later his friend and colleague, Jerome, was martyred. The death of these men led to a long religious war in Bohemia.

The capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 had a powerful effect on Christendom. It took away from it its Eastern capital, and paralyzed the Eastern

Papal Supremacy

Church. It drove Greek scholarship to the West, and greatly helped on the revival of learning, on which the truest reform was founded.

The *Imitation of Christ*, credited to Thomas à Kempis, one of the "Brethren of the Common Life," was issued about 1470. It has had as wide a circulation as perhaps any other book but the Bible.

For the second time in history the papacy again descended to the lowest depths of infamy. One has to go back to the worst days of ancient Rome to find rulers more execrable than those who sat on the chair of Peter during the last quarter of the fifteenth century.

The martyrdom of Savonarola (1498) in Florence profoundly impressed all Europe. His strange character the closest study cannot fully define. He was a sort of Hebrew prophet in the midst of mediæval luxuries in Italy. He was a politician as well as a reformer, and made fatal mistakes. But his sincerity, his lofty patriotism, and his genuine piety cannot be doubted. He never renounced the creed of Rome, but his death was in the interest of reform.

Martin Luther,
and the Reformation

“Confute me by proofs of Scripture, or else by plain just arguments. Otherwise I cannot recant. For it is neither safe nor prudent to speak anything against conscience. Here stand I ; I can do no other. God assist me ! Amen.”—**MARTIN LUTHER.**

The Reformation

I

The Story of Martin Luther

OF pious parentage, Martin Luther was born at Eisleben, in Lower Saxony, on November 10, 1483, and on the morrow was dedicated to God in baptism, being named after the saint enrolled in the Roman calendar for that day. The poverty of his father's family was extreme. He early received religious impressions. From boyhood he was of a reflective nature; his early life was well ordered; chastity was ever to him a source of strength and courage.

Entering manhood, he began the study of law at Erfurt, where he was a faithful and brilliant student. "The whole university," wrote Melanchthon, "admired his genius." There he became for the first time familiar with the contents of the Bible, which he had previously known only in fragments. "O that God would give me such a book for myself!" he exclaimed. At the age of twenty he received the degree of Bachelor of Arts. But he passed the

The Reformation

examination at the sacrifice of health, and suddenly became seriously ill.

As he lay upon his bed his soul was in stress and storm. In weakness and agitation of flesh and spirit, in a sort of twilight of contrition, believing himself to be on the verge of death, he earnestly reviewed his life. An aged priest, who had taken a kindly interest in him, sat down by his side. "My dear bachelor," he said, "take courage. Our God will yet make of you a man who, in turn, will console many. God lays his cross upon those whom he loves, and they who bear it patiently acquire wisdom." By these words Luther was comforted, and from this period dated a higher spiritual life.

Upon his recovery he took up with eagerness the course of study, receiving in 1505, in his twenty-second year, the degree of Master of Arts, and becoming Professor of Philosophy in the University. In this advancement he was still concerned about his soul's salvation, which anxious state of mind was greatly increased by the sudden death of Alexis, an intimate college friend.

Soon after this incident, while returning to Erfurt from a visit to his parents, he was

The Reformation

overtaken by a severe thunderstorm, and in the danger of his position death and judgment again appeared vividly to him. "Encompassed with the anguish and terror of death," as he wrote afterward, he vowed that if his soul were only saved he would devote himself entirely to Christ, abandoning the laws of the world and the flesh, and casting aside ambitions for legal eminence which in his youth he had cherished. While in prayer it seemed to him that the very savor and Spirit of God descended upon him; trembling with aspiration, there came to him much happiness and peace. On his arrival at Erfurt he announced to several friends his determination to enter an Augustinian convent; and on the evening of August 17, 1505, left the college, taking with him two books, Vergil and Plautus. Assuming the name of Augustine, he thus became a monk, hoping to escape from the sins of the outer world.

To his father, who had made great sacrifices to help in educating his son, this act represented an eternal farewell to the world. But the world to Luther was one of meanness and misery. He longed for a better and higher life than he saw any-

The Reformation

where about him, and fancied that he would find it in a monastery. With delight he pictured the dignity and gravity of the cloister, the constant indulgence of elevating thought, the communion of learned and holy men, the charm of strict behavior. He was soon disillusioned. By monastic rules he was forced to serve a severe and long apprenticeship in the performance of menial duties. When, through the intercession of the university, Luther was released from this humble position, and allowed to spend his time in study, he found few congenial companions. With the works of the fathers of the Church he became familiar, particularly with the thinking and teaching of Augustine, whose great truths he was destined to reassert with no uncertain voice. He was a most pious monk. "If ever a monk could obtain heaven by his monkish works," he afterward wrote, "I should certainly have been entitled to it. If it had continued much longer I should have carried my mortifications even to death, by means of my watchings, prayers, readings, and other labors." But most of the inmates of the convent were below himself in both learning and character.

The Reformation

God soon sent graciously to Luther a wise friend, who, having passed through his mental conflicts, could the better advise him rightly. "It is not in vain," he said, "that God exercises you in so many conflicts; you will see that he will employ you as his servant for great purposes." This friend was John Staupitz, vicar-general of the Augustine monks of Germany, whose judicious counsels enabled Luther to experience the saving influence of the vital truths of the Gospel. After a residence of two years in the cloister Luther was on Sunday, May 2, 1507, ordained a priest, and began immediately to preach in many of the surrounding villages.

In 1508 Staupitz recommended him for the appointment of Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wittenberg, established recently by the Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise. In obedience to the call Luther left Erfurt, taking with him a Greek and Latin Bible, a Concordance, a few volumes of the Latin poets, and several of the treatises of Aristotle. In addition to the duties of his new position, he had also to preach at Wittenberg, which he did in an unconventional and fearless manner, basing his

The Reformation

sermons chiefly on the Holy Scriptures, awakening general attention and admiration by the eloquence and force of his utterances.

In 1510 a dissension arose concerning certain issues between the vicar-general, Staupitz, and seven convents of the Augustine order. Much against his own pleasure, Luther was sent to Rome to obtain a settlement of the disputes. "Hail, holy Rome! thrice holy for the blood of the martyrs shed there," he exclaimed, as he first viewed the Eternal City. But a short residence in Rome soon dissipated his cherished beliefs in the sanctity of the Church. He was a horrified witness of a city sunk in immorality of every sort, and was astounded by the secularity, and even licentiousness, of the papal court. The pope and princes of the Church had lost faith. "No one can imagine," Luther said later, "what sins and infamous actions are committed in Rome; they must be seen and heard to be believed. They are in the habit of saying, 'If there is a hell, Rome is built over it; it is an abyss whence issues every kind of sin.'" All his sentimental enthusiasm for the Church was destroyed by the degraded spectacle, and,

The Reformation

having finished his mission, he returned to Wittenberg feeling that "Rome, once the holiest, is now the worst of cities."

Luther was now created a Licentiate of Theology, taking the following oath: "I swear to defend the evangelical truth with all my might." On the day following, October 19, 1512, he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity. He was made a biblical doctor, devoting himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, promising to preach them faithfully, to teach them with purity, and, so far as God should give him ability, to defend them, both in disputation and in writing, against all false teachers.

Luther's zeal led him to attack in ninety-nine theses the Pelagian rationalism of the scholastic theology. But a greater opportunity for the exercise of his earnestness of spirit and his polemical powers came with the appearance, in 1517, of John Tetzel, a notorious monk, employed by Pope Leo X in the sale of indulgences, so that money could be raised to finish Saint Peter's, at Rome. This man announced that he had power to deliver a full discharge from the penalties of sin; his indulgences were not only sold, but were forced upon those who

The Reformation

indulgences
refused them. The gross deception and blasphemy of this vending of licenses to sin aroused the opposition of Luther. "God willing," he exclaimed, "I will beat a hole in his drum." "Have a care," he preached, "how you listen to the clamors of these indulgence-merchants: you have better things to do than to buy these licenses which they sell at so vile a price."

On learning of Luther's conduct Tetzel cursed the Wittenberg monk, and, lighting a fire in the market place, threatened the burning at the stake of all heretics who should interfere with his proceedings. Nothing daunted, Luther wrote to Jerome, Bishop of Brandenburg, and to Albert, Archbishop of Mayence, entreating the cessation of this infamous traffic; but as the archbishop profited by the sale Luther of necessity was not answered.

The festival of All Saints was now fast approaching, and the town of Wittenberg was crowded with pilgrims, come to witness the relics in the church which the elector had built. At noon of October 31, 1517, the day before the festival, Luther, whose resolute mind had conceived a daring act, posted upon the door of the church ninety-

The Reformation

five theses, or propositions, protesting against the doctrine and practice of the selling of indulgences.

In a preface Luther declared that he had written the theses with the desire that the truth should be asserted in the full light of day, and that he was ready to defend them on the morrow, in the university, against all opponents. In these theses he laid down the position that "the pope is unable to remit any other penalty than which he himself has imposed of his own good pleasure, or conformably to the canons (the papal ordinances)," and that "every Christian who truly repents of his sin enjoys an entire remission both of the penalty and of the guilt, without any need of indulgences."

The thirty-second proposition announced that "those who fancy themselves sure of salvation by indulgences will go to perdition along with those who teach them so;" the sixty-second, that "the true and precious treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God;" and the ninety-fifth, that "it is far better to enter into the kingdom of heaven through much tribulation than to acquire a carnal security by the consolation of a false peace."

The Reformation

In the theses, the real significance of which were not as yet comprehended wholly even by their author, the evangelical doctrine of a free and gratuitous remission of sins was directly proclaimed. Before this truth all errors were to disappear.

In relation to Luther's act, it is curious to note that on the night preceding the posting of the theses, a tradition represents the Elector Frederick of Saxony as having dreamed that he had seen a monk writing on the door of the Wittenberg church in characters so large that at his palace at Sweinitz, six leagues distant, he could discern what was written. "The pen he used was so long that its extremity reached as far as Rome, where it pierced the ears of a lion who lay there, and shook the triple crown on the pope's head."

It was in this wise that the religious tornado of the sixteenth century began. Up to All Saints' Day not so much as a rumor of the coming agitation had been heard. Luther had preached, but had not acted; no one had divined the definite rebellion in him. The world had been on the verge of a great ecclesiastical reformation; now occurred the outbreak of dissension which was

The Reformation

to transform the Church. At the initial clamor there was a hush; then a murmur and an effort to suppress Luther; but he steadfastly defended his beliefs. In the possession of advanced views, he had carefully deliberated on the judicious course to pursue, but he could not foresee; so, trusting in God, having taken his stand, he waited.

An extraordinary commotion was aroused by the theses; they were circulated everywhere, and reached Rome at an early date. "In a fortnight," said Myconius, "they were in every part of Germany, and in four weeks they had traversed the whole of Christendom, as if the very angels had been their messengers, and had placed them before the eyes of all men. No one can believe what noise they made." They were translated into Dutch and Spanish, and were even sold in Jerusalem. "Everyone," wrote Luther, "complained of the indulgences, and as all the bishops and doctors had kept silence, and nobody was willing to bell the cat, poor Luther became a famous doctor, because (as they said) there came one at last who ventured to do it. But I did not like this glory, and the tune was nearly too high for my voice."

The Reformation

The Emperor Maximilian, weary of the exactions of the pope, was in open sympathy with Luther's boldness, and said to the Elector Frederick, "Let the Wittenberg monk be taken good care of; we may some day want him."

Reuchlin and Erasmus, who against the superstitions of the Church had long waged effective warfare, received the theses with joy. "Thanks be to God!" exclaimed the former, "at last they have found a man who will give them so much to do that they will be compelled to let my old age end in peace." "The whole world applauded," declared Erasmus, "and there was a general assent." "I observe," he said at another time, "that the greater their evangelical piety and the purer their morals the less are men opposed to Luther. His life is praised even by those who cannot endure his faith. The world was weary of a doctrine so full of puerile fables and human ordinances, and thirsted for that living, pure, and hidden water which springs from the veins of the evangelists and apostles. Luther's genius was fitted to accomplish these things, and his zeal caught fire at so glorious an enterprise."

The Reformation

Luther's break with the Church of Rome was not at first complete. He had not accused the pope himself directly, only the pope's representatives. He retained for the pontiff himself a deep respect, in his fiftieth proposition saying: "If the pope knew of the extortions of the preachers of indulgences, he would rather the mother Church of Saint Peter were burnt and reduced to ashes than to see it built up with the skin, the flesh, and the bones of his flock." Often it is that a great movement begins with an aim much narrower than that which those who support it have finally to adopt. It was against the sale of indulgences alone that Luther at first protested, and, had Leo X acceded to the demands from Germany after the publication of the ninety-five theses, the Reformation would have been postponed, perhaps for centuries, and the monk of Wittenberg, with all his personal peculiarities, would never have been a great historical personage. Slowly, however, Luther realized how irreconcilable was his interpretation of the Gospel with the accepted theory of papal authority. "With what anxiety of labor," he afterward wrote, "with what searching of the Scriptures,

The Reformation

did I justify myself, in conscience, in standing up against the pope!"

On learning of the affair at Wittenberg Leo X at first justified Luther's confidence, and declined to act against him. "Friar Martin is a man of fine genius," he said, and styled the doctrinal commotion "a squabble of envious monks." But the sweep of events before long put Luther before Leo in a different light; his beliefs became heresies, and he was characterized as visionary, unreasonable, and fanatical. In August, 1518, the trouble had come to a head, and Leo, through his legate, Cajetan, undertook to subdue the aggressive spirit of the Wittenberg professor.

"We charge you," wrote Leo to the legate, "to summon personally before you, to prosecute and constrain without delay, the said Luther. . . . And if you get possession of his body, keep him in safe custody, that he may be brought before us." In the case of Luther's submission, Cajetan was given power to receive him again into the Church. But "if he persist in his obstinacy, and if you cannot secure his person, we authorize you to prosecute him in every part of Germany; to banish, curse, and ex-

The Reformation

communicate all those who are attached to him, and to order all Christians to flee from his presence." At Augsburg, on October 7, 1518, Cajetan met the reformer, but in his efforts to obtain a retraction of his opinions achieved little success. A bull was presently issued by Leo reaffirming the doctrine of indulgences; and Luther then appealed from the pope to a general council.

In 1519, in a public disputation at Leipsic, he took part in a debate with Dr. John Eck, a theologian of much eminence, who had vehemently attacked his views. At this disputation, a most important episode in his career, Luther created a sensation by his declaration of the Christian spirit of several of the articles of John Hus, for which the Bohemian preacher had been condemned at the Council of Constance, in 1415. He instanced Hus's declaration "that there is but one universal Church," and that "it is not necessary for salvation to believe the Roman Catholic Church superior to all others." "These things," concluded Luther, "are truth."

A significant result of this disputation was his final separation from Rome. In

The Reformation

the spring of 1520 he published his "Address to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation," in which he entreated them to take a steadfast stand in the reformation of the Church. In a short time four thousand copies of this work were sold. The tremendous force of the man, his real manhood, the depth of his spiritual life, began to be felt, and gained for him a multitude of supporters. A treatise on the "Babylonian Captivity of the Church" followed the address; in this he attacked transubstantiation, together with the ordinances which prescribed pilgrimages, fastings, and monasticism.

On June 15, 1520, a papal bull was sent to Germany which excommunicated Luther and commanded the Elector Frederick to deliver him up to the pope. In this bull were quoted forty-one "pernicious, scandalous, and poisonous propositions" from the writings of the reformer. It concluded with the statement that "he must give up preaching, teaching, and writing, and commit his works to the flames. And if he does not retract in the space of sixty days, we by these presents condemn both him and his adherents as open and obsti-

The Reformation

nate heretics." In such wise did the tottering papacy anathematize Luther, filling Europe with the uproar. Events were to prove the uselessness of the maledictions.

Advised by the sagacious Erasmus, who was at this time most friendly to Luther, the elector determined to protect the reformer. To Frederick Erasmus observed that "Luther has committed two unpardonable crimes : he has attacked the pope's crown and the monks' stomachs."

Meanwhile Luther publicly styled the papal decree the "execrable bull of Antichrist." On the morning of December 10, 1520, upon the walls of the university were posted invitations to the professors and students to assemble at nine o'clock, at the Eastern Gate, where had been erected a scaffold, upon which was to be enacted a strange and dramatic scene. A fire was prepared, and as the flames arose Luther approached, holding the Decretals, the Canon Law, the Clementines, the papal Extravagants, the writings of Eck and Esmer, and the bull of Leo X. The Decretals being burned, Luther exhibited the bull, saying, "Since thou hast vexed the Holy One of the Lord, may everlasting

The Reformation

fire vex and consume thee." It was then thrown into the fire and destroyed, and, applauded by the spectators, Luther returned to the university. "My enemies," he declared, "have been able, by burning my books, to injure the cause of truth in the minds of the common people, and destroy their souls; for this reason I destroy their books in return. Hitherto I have been only playing with the pope. I began this work in God's name; it will be ended without me and by his might." Wanton heresy was this, indeed—but heresy that was to become orthodoxy.

Against Luther still another bull was issued; and by the Emperor of Germany he was summoned to appear before an Imperial Diet, assembled at Worms, in the west of Germany, on the Rhine. On the arrival at Wittenberg of the summons, Luther's friends advised him to disobey it, despite the emperor's promise of safe-conduct both in his going and coming from Worms. The emperor's guarantee was not sufficient, they said, for in the preceding century John Hus had gone to the Council of Constance under a safe-conduct from the Emperor Sigismund, and, nevertheless, he had

The Reformation

been burned. But warnings and entreaties could not alter Luther's determination to attend the Diet. Bidding farewell to Melanchthon, the dearest of his associates, he said: "My dear brother, if I do not return, and should my enemies put me to death, continue to teach, and stand fast in the truth. Labor in my stead, since I shall no longer be able to labor for myself. If you survive, my death will be of little consequence."

The route to Worms was one of triumphant progress. Everywhere the reformer received the enthusiastic acclamation of the people. Being reminded on his journey of the fate of Hus, he answered, "Hus was burned, but the truth was not. I would go on, though there were as many devils as there are tiles on the housetops."

Reaching Worms, he appeared on April 17, 1521, before the council; a solitary black-robed monk in the presence of the youthful emperor, Charles V, archbishops, bishops, princes, dukes, counts, barons, ambassadors; in all a court of two hundred and four individuals, in the midst of whom stood Luther, the central figure of a drama than which, says Froude, there is no

The Reformation

grander in history or fiction. As a result of that drama the supremacy of Rome and the Catholic faith over Germany, England, and other parts of northern Europe was to pass irrecoverably away.

of Luther
And as Luther stood there, about the muscles of his jaw was seen the stamp of that force which is known as Will. Of the inward ferment there was little if any outward show. He viewed the council narrowly, with eyes no longer pensive and abstracted, but which had in them the glitter of steel. His face was resolute; it expressed a determination menacing and inflexible as the chill and the point of a bayonet. The court was dumfounded by this man, so terribly in earnest. As he answered the charges brought against him the marvelous magnetism which was in him, and which had made him what he was, seemed to coerce the hearers, despite themselves, to his mood, his opinions, himself. His mere attitude and manner were a seduction so alluring that through it the opposition of his enemies began visibly to disappear. Called upon to retract the contents of his works, he made the significant declaration that, "Unless I am convinced

The Reformation

by the testimony of Scripture and reason, I cannot and I will not retract, for it is unsafe for a man to speak anything against his conscience. Here I stand; I can do nothing else. God help me. Amen!"

By the emperor Luther was dismissed; but the imperial was added to the papal ban. Some there were who demanded that no respect should be paid to the safe-conduct given to him. "The Rhine," they said, "should receive his ashes, as it received those of John Hus a century ago." In later years Charles regretted that he had allowed Luther to pass in peace from the Diet. But the reformer was not without defenders, and on his return to Wittenberg the soldiers of the elector, according to a prearranged plan, transported him to the Castle of the Wartburg, in Thuringia. For a year he remained in this secure retreat, "abiding," says Malthesius, "like St. Paul in his prison at Rome." In his captivity he was occupied with the translation of the Bible into popular German, which work of love was to be such a blessed and effective agency in the spread of truth.

At last, in March, 1522, leaving the castle, he appeared again in his old pulpit

The Reformation

at Wittenberg, where he took up his former life, laboring devotedly as preacher, teacher, and writer. In 1524 and 1525 there occurred the Peasants' Revolution, an uprising against the exactions of the nobles and the clergy. Although just in part, in the main their claims were extravagant, and when the revolt came Luther supported uncompromisingly the cause of the princes. His advice to the nobles to crush the revolution with force has been emphasized unjustly by many historians, but little has been said about Luther's previous work in the interest of peace and in behalf of the peasants themselves.

The broad statement that the reformer was a sympathizer with princes and not with the people is a great error. Luther, when appealed to by the peasants, wrote his *Exhortations to Peace: On the Twelve Articles of the Peasantry of Swabia*. In this he sharply rebuked princes, nobles, bishops, and priests, who in their temporal government "tax and fleece their subjects for the advancement of their own pomp and pride, until the common people can endure it no longer." He agreed with the justness of many of their claims, although he in-

The Reformation

sisted that violence and force must not be used against governments. He gave to both sides, the nobles and the peasants, his "faithful counsel and advice, that a few counts and lords should be chosen from the nobility and a few councilors from the towns, and that matters should be adjusted and composed in an amicable manner, so that the affair, if it can be arranged in a Christian spirit, may at least be settled according to human laws and agreements." Thus spoke Luther, wrote Köstlin, with "his accustomed frankness, fervency, power, and bluntness, equally indifferent to the favor of the people or of their rulers." Luther said later: "In my former tract I did not venture to condemn the peasants. . . . But before I could look about me, forth they rush and fight and plunder and rage like mad dogs."

On January 13, 1515, the year in which the revolt ended, Luther married Katharine von Bora, previously a nun of the Cistercian order. The dream of celibacy had faded, as such dreams do; and in the happiness of his home he proved to the world the discretion of his step.

Since the memorable Diet of Worms

The Reformation

Luther had been busied in the translation of the Bible and in the prolific composition of many works of a religious character. In the first ten years of the Reformation the number of his sermons, tracts, hymns, and catechisms reached the astonishing total of three hundred, four hundred and fifteen being added in the two decades following. In addition to this prodigious labor he was engaged in numerous disputations, including an unfortunate one with Erasmus, which resulted in a partial alienation between the Saxon reformer and the distinguished humanist—that intrepid knight-errant of free thought who ever went about combating intolerance; among the first, in fact, to break a lance in the Lutheran struggle. Luther's rare controversial ability was exercised constantly. Invective with him reached the height of an art, although on occasion he descended to mere vituperation. Whatever the world may think, such abuse is not argument; but it is always easier to handle a club than a rapier. Luther made use of both.

In 1521 Henry VIII wrote a reply to
The Babylonian Captivity, Luther's work
on the sacraments. From Leo X this

The Reformation

answer gained for the monarch the title of "Defender of the Faith," a title belonging more properly to the reformer himself. Replying in impassioned language, Luther's imagination, set on fire by his passions, produced a prodigy of invective, so made up of religion and rage as to make one hesitate whether more to applaud the soaring of this inspired soul or to re-buke its temper.

Despite the difficulties that beset it, the Reformation continued its territorial progress; many important results were incorporated in the life and faith of the movement. The name "Protestant" had been given definitely to it by the protest which the Elector Frederick and other princes, together with fourteen cities, made at the Diet of Spires, in 1529, against a decree of the emperor having as its object the endeavor to arrest the growing strength of the Lutheran party.

In the ensuing years dissensions arose among the Protestants themselves; there were signs of a coming Catholic reaction, and in the religious conflicts of the times the cause was not always aided. In the midst of this strife the great reformer ap-

The Reformation

proached the end of his career. A sick man, he had gone to Eisleben to reconcile the Counts of Mansfield, who had long been contending regarding certain hereditary privileges. After long negotiations, his efforts toward reconciliation were successful; but on February 17, 1546, the fatal indications of the end appeared, which culminated in an early hour of the next day. Thus, after a life that shook the world, he died in his historic birthplace, that town which lies, jewel-like, in its hill-surrounded valley. Before he breathed his last, he was asked if he died trusting in the Church and in the doctrines which he had preached. A firm, triumphant "Yes" was his reply. He had not retracted that faith before emperor and diet; he now confirmed it before the throne of God.

The many-sidedness of Luther, his comprehensive character, was one factor of his greatness. He was one of the world's few great creative men. He had faults, made mistakes, but he was the representative man of his times, in whom the strivings and longings of the people came to clear thought, decisive word and deed. His rich humanity was a part of this many-sided-

The Reformation

ness, a humanity that responded to home, society, music, song, and education. He was no ascetic, but a man with the large spirit of a loving child, who took the gifts of his heavenly Father joyfully, gratefully.

Death was impotent to check the work which he began. In every church communion his influence lives. Neither the Roman nor the Greek Church had escaped it. John Calvin declared that "It is not so much Luther who speaks, as God, whose lightnings burst from his lips." It was his especial mission to bring to accurate statement the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the central doctrine of Holy Scripture.

Quite independently of Luther, Zwingli (1484-1531) established the Swiss Reformation. John Calvin (1509-1564), one of the loftiest intellects ever devoted to the Church, made Geneva the metropolis of Reformed Christendom. He impressed his character on Protestantism more deeply than any other man with the exception of Martin Luther. Lutheranism became the Reformed religion of Germany and Scandinavia; Calvinism, the Reformed faith of France, Holland, and Scotland, besides pervading all English Protestantism.

The Reformation

II

The Seventeenth Century

IN 1500, as we have seen, European Christianity was Roman. Individual thinkers and small sects shuddered in secret places, but heresy, wherever discovered, was suppressed. One hundred years later the larger part of Germany and Scandinavia were Protestant; in England the Reformation was established by law, while in France and Switzerland the cultured classes had become Protestant. This was a revolution as sudden and sweeping as that which in Paul's day changed Christianity from a Jewish sect to a Gentile faith, as that which in Constantine's day changed a persecuted religion into an imperial *protégé*.

But in France the cause of Gospel freedom was paralyzed for centuries by the massacre of Saint Bartholomew; and, though a few years later Henry IV granted certain privileges to his Protestant subjects, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes sent the Huguenots, with their religious feeling,

The Reformation

their technical skill, and their commercial energy, flying to other lands. In Germany, while the northern princes were friendly to the Lutheran cause, the Jesuits swayed the ruling classes in the South and the East.

In Hungary and Bohemia three fourths of the people were Protestants. After prolonged efforts, guided by the Jesuits, to bring the Bohemians back to the Church, the land was surrendered to its executioners in 1621. Men were executed by the hundred, others were banished, thirty thousand of the best people fled to other countries, and the population was reduced from four million to one million. This shocking blunder and crime, like the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, enriched Germany and Switzerland and England with thousands of intellectual and skilled men. It is an awful scene, this—the Church of Christ stabbing sleeping women to death in Paris, subjecting maidens and children to the most excruciating wrongs by the dragonnades, burning and plundering and punishing in Bohemia, racking nerves and muscles by thumbscrews and the rack in the Inquisition in Spain, burning bishops at the stake in England, and slaughtering men and

The Reformation

women and children by the hundred in Holland.

The Church of Rome put forth fresh activity to recover the ground lost by the Reformation. The Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was established in 1622 by Gregory XV; a college for the training of missionaries to the heathen was established by Urban VIII; priests were sent out to the ends of the earth. The Jesuits especially were remarkably laborious and enthusiastic. The Roman Church made a difference between the treatment of heathen and Protestants. Benedict IV and Pius VI affirmed that heathens should not be forced into the Church, but that baptized Protestants were to be compelled where possible.

Reformed England became thoroughly irreligious in the latter part of the seventeenth century. The Church had never been widely spiritual, and puritanism rapidly became contaminated. Skepticism grew apace. English Nonconformists "divided and subdivided, and hated each other." Nonconformists of all sorts were so bitterly persecuted by the Church of England that their position was little better than that of Protestants in France or Spain. All who

The Reformation

attended private meetings for worship were put under penalties. Two thousand ministers were rejected because they refused to submit to the iniquitous act of uniformity, and any one of them was subject to a fine of forty pounds or six months' imprisonment if he came within five miles of his former charge. If you became a Quaker you might be transported to the colonies. No one could be a magistrate or a member of a corporation who did not subscribe to the liturgy. It was almost as hard to be a Roman Catholic as to be a Nonconformist. A price was set upon the head of a Catholic priest, and mass was forbidden. Gradually, however, the kings, James II especially, became more and more inclined toward the old faith. This century was one of increasing skepticism, worldliness, and immorality. But some of the noblest of English divines lived at this time, Usher, Leighton, Jeremy Taylor, Dr. South, Thomas Fuller, Pearson, Barrow, Robert Boyle, Chillingworth, and many others.

During the seventeenth century the Protestant churches of the Continent divided on doctrinal questions, with much bitterness. Arminius of Leyden antagonized the Cal-

The Reformation

vinist doctrines of election and reprobation. The Synod of Dort (1618) was on the whole a victory for the Calvinists, and the Arminians were banished from Holland. There was no section of the divided Church, however, during all these disturbed years which did not furnish examples of eminent piety and devotion. The Pietists and Quietists of Germany advanced the Christian life of thousands of people.

John Wesley,
and the Modern Evangelical Church

“ The love of Christ doth me constrain
To seek the wandering souls of men ;
With cries, entreaties, tears, to save,—
To snatch them from the gaping grave.

“ For this let men revile my name ;
No cross I shun, I fear no shame :
All hail, reproach ; and welcome, pain ;
Only thy terrors, Lord, restrain.

“ Give me thy strength, O God of power :
Then let winds blow, or thunders roar,
Thy faithful witness will I be :
’Tis fixed ; I can do all through thee.”

—JOHN WESLEY.

The Modern Church

I

The Story of John Wesley

It is not needful to retell the early life of John Wesley. The remarkable character of his mother; the methodical, happy home; the poverty and intellectuality of his boyish environments; his education at the Charter House School; his honorable record as student of Christ Church College; the lofty but narrow piety of his young manhood—all these are facts familiar to the intelligent young Methodist.

At the age of twenty-three (1726) John Wesley was appointed moderator or president of the logical discussions of his college, and Professor of Greek. He was then harassed with theological doubts, but tended to mysticism; while a practical piety regulated his life. He seemed made to think like Mary and to live like Martha. Absent from the university for a short time, John Wesley returned to find that the "Godly Club" had been formed by a few devout students, including his brother

The Modern Church

Charles, and that the rules, or "methods," of sanctity adopted by these youths had gained them the *sobriquet* of "Methodists." John naturally became their leader, for he was born to organize and to rule. He prescribed for them certain austerities, together with regular visitations among the poor, and the partaking of the sacraments.

In 1735 he set sail for Georgia, to serve as chaplain to the colonists. While there he sought to establish schools and orphan asylums, and to evangelize the Indians. But his endeavors were not successful, and his inner life was increasingly disturbed by doubt, inquietude, and repentance. Sad at heart, and disappointed in his ambitions, he returned to England. He had heard from Moravian friends that faith does not consist in an adherence to revealed truths, but in an interior sentiment of love to God. This doctrine, though common to all the Reformed Churches, had been well-nigh lost sight of in England. In vain did Wesley seek within his own heart for this interior life. His days were passed in anxiety and despair. He constantly feared death and "the wrath to come;" for he knew that he was a sinner, and unpardoned.

The Modern Church

But the time came when he consciously found justifying grace, and his spirit became possessed of perfect tranquillity and assurance, though without any sudden accession of joy.

To become more acquainted with the Moravians, who had pointed out to him this way of salvation, he journeyed to the Continent, met the holy Count Zinzendorf, and carefully studied the simple ecclesiastical organization which that count had adopted from the Pietist Spener. When he returned to England he found that his brother Charles and George Whitefield had been led through very similar spiritual experiences, and were testifying their consciousness of pardon.

George Whitefield was a young man of poverty, whose mother, a servant in Oxford, had procured for him, by arduous efforts, a clerical education. He was inferior to Wesley in many respects, but he was more absolute in doctrine, and his eloquence as a preacher was unequalled. Ordained in 1736, his first sermon, preached at Bristol, was said to have made "fifteen of his auditors crazy." Everywhere his preaching aroused acute contrition. The

The Modern Church

regular clergymen called him "a spiritual pickpocket" because he drew away their congregations. When churches were closed against him he took to the open air. All England echoed with the fame of his oratory.

When John Wesley, with his newborn faith in God, undertook to preach in London, churches were quickly closed against him as they had been against Whitefield. He was prepared, therefore, to listen to an appeal from his friend, whose congregations now included thousands, to come and join him. Wesley's first field sermon, preached near Bristol, was heard by three thousand persons. He gave himself immediately to the task of gathering the mining population into small bands or classes, each one directed by a leader of the same sex as the members, and pledged to unite regularly for prayer, reading of the Bible, and religious conversation. The religious organization of so degraded a people, and the great moral change that was wrought among them, was the first convincing testimony of the two evangelists that their work was thoroughly good. Soon the building of a chapel became a necessity. All this

The Modern Church

was the work of a few months. Whitefield's first sermon was preached February 17, 1739; Wesley's, April 20; the corner stone of the first chapel was laid May 12.

By the end of the year Bristol, Wales, Oxford, and London had heard the preachers. Audiences of twenty and thirty thousand were gathered from the slums of the metropolis. Indubitable conversions of soul and reformations of life, by the hundred, and presently by the thousand, showed that the work was divine. Strange physical phenomena often accompanied the sermons.

Wesley was as careful about doctrine as he was about conduct. He separated from his old friends the Moravians because of their laxity of doctrine, and opposed the Calvinistic teachings of Whitefield, who had now gone back to America. Whitefield wrote a hasty response, full of bitterness; before a large assembly Wesley tore Whitefield's letter to pieces. In 1741, with much of hard feeling and much of damage to the holy cause, Methodism was divided into two branches, Whitefield at the head of one, John Wesley at the head of the other.

John Wesley never formally detached

The Modern Church

himself from the Established Church, but its authorities had no sympathy for him. Remonstrances, interdictions, menaces, and mobs were everywhere in his way. But this did not hinder the increase of the work. So great were the throngs that continually gathered to hear the preachers that against his will Wesley was soon constrained to approve of laymen preaching. Thomas Maxfield and John Nelson were the first lay preachers. More and more distinctly through the months did the Wesleyan societies take form.

In 1743 the first "Conference" of the leaders of Wesleyan Methodism, including six pastors and four lay preachers, was held at the Foundry Chapel, London, and confirmed all the rules and proceedings of their chief in classing the whole membership in four divisions: The United Societies, Band Meetings, Class Meetings, and the Penitents, or those who were still unconverted but expressed a desire for salvation—the only condition requisite for admission to the fellowship of the Methodists.

The attacks of intolerance now began to assume more boldly the form of persecution. Wild bulls were driven into the gatherings

The Modern Church

of hearers in order to break up the meetings; petards and squibs were thrown among them; stones were hurled upon the roofs of houses for the purpose of injuring the preacher. The magistrates naturally sided with the hostile clergy, and often with the mobs. To this day the register of the parish of Poole bears record of the expenses of certain church wardens, payable to the innkeeper of the place, said expenses being incurred for the purpose of "chasing out the Methodists." The Edinburgh Theater announced a derisive play entitled "Trick upon Trick, or Methodism Unveiled." The Methodists were publicly accused of setting fire to houses; of favoring the dethronement of the king, and John Wesley was compelled by a magistrate to renew his oath of allegiance and declaration against papacy. And yet John Wesley was at heart a conservative. At the outbreak of the American War for Independence he declared himself on the side of the mother country, and when he saw the first kindlings of the French Revolution he energetically denounced it.

Toward the middle of the century Methodism had planted itself firmly and was gain-

The Modern Church

ing ground. Wesley was permitted to preach at Oxford. He had become one of the foremost men in England, the leader of an association which extended over all his country. He had pushed his conquests into Ireland, and was astonished at the cordiality of his reception.

Meanwhile Whitefield had made an influential adherent in Selina Shirley, widow of the ninth Count of Huntingdon. She gave herself and her great fortune to Christian works, endowed colleges, and built chapels. Lords Bolingbroke and Chesterfield, Benjamin Franklin, Pitt, and other foremost men attest the extraordinary eloquence of Whitefield.

To the delight of all lovers of Methodism a reconciliation was at length effected between Whitefield and Wesley. They were not again associated as at first, and never agreed in theology, but pursued simultaneously the same work, and manifested tender affection for each other. When, sixteen years later, Whitefield died, Wesley learned with emotion that the last wish of his friend was that he should preach his funeral sermon.

Up to the age of forty-nine Wesley had

The Modern Church

lived in celibacy, though his heart had not remained intact from tender influences. Why he married in 1752, after having been so long convinced that it was his duty to live a single life, and how he came to be so egregiously deceived in the choice of a wife, it is not easy to explain. His wife was insanely jealous and utterly unappreciative. After making existence almost insupportable for him for nineteen years she left him in February, 1771.

In his later life Wesley became the administrator of government to a kingdom which he had formed and given to Christ, and his life was passed amid abundant cares. He was profoundly respected by many of the highest of the land, though some of the clergy still attacked him. Then, too, certain "Methodist" fanaticisms had to be suppressed. In 1770 his societies included 29,466 members, and Wesley was compelled to take action which, though not entirely separating from the Establishment, would secure their perpetuity. Two hundred and twelve itinerants preached under his rules.

The last twenty years of Wesley's life furnish us with a beautiful picture. He seemed utterly insensible to the weight of

The Modern Church

years; traveled night and day, and preached wherever he stopped for refreshment. His industry has never been surpassed. All his life he had been writing pamphlets and letters, and he now published his works in thirty-three closely printed volumes.

The Revolution in America had chased away the Church of England rectors and left the masses in many regions entirely without Church privileges. Wesley appointed Thomas Coke to supervise these American societies, and in 1784 this good man was consecrated to be superintendent (bishop). Francis Asbury was soon chosen to be his colleague.

When eighty years of age John Wesley projected a missionary tour to France. At eighty-seven he still preached three times each Sunday. Not till February, 1791, did he leave the pulpit never to ascend it again. He had preached not less than fifty-two thousand four hundred times from the date of his return from America. He expired on the morning of March 2, 1791, surrounded by his friends. His fatal illness was made beautiful by loving testimonies of the power of God. His last word was "Farewell."

The Modern Church

II

"The March of Methodism"

THE forces set in motion by the Wesleys now affect every part of the world. The story of the prayer meeting held in the rigging loft in New York city, from which the great Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States has developed, is familiar to all reading Methodists. Methodists are to-day numbered by the million.

We present in the following table the latest data of Methodism in the United States:

METHODIST DIVISIONS.	Ministers.	Churches.	Total Communi- cants.
African Methodist Episcopal Church..	4,252	4,425	528,029
African Methodist Episcopal Zion.....	3,650	1,605	425,000
African Union Methodist Episcopal...	115	115	3,869
Colored Methodist Episcopal Church..	1,224	3,672	128,817
Congregational Methodists.....	150	214	8,765
Congregational Methodist, Colored....	5	5	319
Congregational Methodist, New.....	20	24	1,059
Evangelical Missionary.....	47	11	951
Free Methodists.....	624	1,102	23,326
Independent Methodists.....	8	15	2,569
Methodist Episcopal Church.....	16,625	25,861	2,698,282
Methodist Episcopal Church, South...	5,786	15,017	1,390,377
Primitive Church.....	65	89	5,005
Protestant Methodist.....	1,500	2,200	162,789
Union American Methodist Episcopal.	115	115	7,081
Wesleyan Methodist.....	600	565	16,492
Zion Union Apostolic.....	30	32	2,346
Total.....	34,816	55,067	5,405,076

The Modern Church

If we would have a proper conception of the great growth of Methodism since Wesley's days we must be prepared to add to these figures those of the flourishing Churches in Great Britain, Canada, and Australia, and the statistics also of the mission stations throughout the world. There are in the United States of America 34,816 Methodist ministers and 5,405,076 members; in the rest of America, 1,885 ministers and 307,269 members. There are in the British Isles 5,630 Methodist ministers and 928,230 members; in the rest of Europe, 473 ministers and 65,599 members. There are in Asia 756 ministers and 160,817 members. There are in Australia 548 Methodist ministers and 170,953 members. These figures aggregate 44,681 ministers and 7,132,041 members.

The Modern Church

III

Low Church, High Church, and Broad Church

WHEN Oliver Cromwell lay dead in Whitehall Palace the national Church was in ruins; the cathedrals had fallen into decay; Saint Paul's, London, had been turned into barracks for the Parliamentary soldiers. There was no order in public worship. Even so good a man as the holy Herbert administered the sacrament only six times a year.

But at once when Queen Anne came to the throne (1702) the work of restoration was begun. A large sum of money was spent to assist the poorer rectors, organs were introduced, and the service brought into something approaching churchly order. Christopher Wren, the famous architect, built no less than fifty parish churches in London, besides rebuilding Saint Paul's, and "religious societies" were formed to give new life to the worship. There were many learned and pious clergy, but some of the

The Modern Church

best of them had scruples about taking the oath of allegiance to William III, and there was much of division and turbulence.

In 1783, after the independence of the American colonies had been recognized, Dr. Seabury was sent to England for ordination, and soon there were four bishops in the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

The rise and progress of Methodism had a wonderful influence on the English Church. It produced many evangelical preachers as thoroughly zealous and simple as the Methodists themselves, and it brought about also a bitter reaction against evangelical doctrine.

The eighteenth century produced many remarkable men in the English Church as well as in the British secular world. Dean Prideaux was a pioneer in the organization of foreign missions; Dr. Sacheverell made a wonderful commotion by his maintenance of the divine right of monarchy and episcopacy; the pamphlets of Daniel De Foe, the author of *Robinson Crusoe*, had a sharp effect on the political side of Church life; Bishop Atterbury was imprisoned and exiled because he refused allegiance to the

The Modern Church

house of Brunswick; Dean Swift strongly opposed concession to the Nonconformists. There were great scholars in those days, such as Bishop Ken, the hymn writer; Bishop Patrick, the commentator; Bishop Pearce, the learned Latinist; Bishop Butler, author of the famous *Analogy*; Archbishop Secker, Bishop Lowth, Bishop Warburton, who violently antagonized Wesley and Whitefield. It was the time when Locke, Isaac Newton, and Berkeley were the foremost philosophers of the world; when Pope and Prior and Swift were writing their poems; when Addison and Steele and Goldsmith were making modern English. Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* was published in 1788, and showed that the battle with unbelief was not over. Among the prominent evangelical clergymen at the end of the eighteenth century were Hervey, Grimshaw, Clayton, Venn, Romaine, Newton of Olney, and Berridge.

Much of iniquity and coarseness was prevalent throughout English-speaking Christendom. There were no Sunday evening services. The streets, especially in London, were unsafe at night. Many country

The Modern Church

churches never had a sermon. Meanwhile, there were powerful Nonconformist preachers, like Rowland Hill and Robert Hall, whose churches were crowded, and the Methodist chapels were always full to overflowing. It seemed as if the entire nation might be withdrawn from the influence of the national Church. Yet there were many godly men and women in the laity as well as among the clergy—Hannah More, William Wilberforce, Samuel Johnson, and others.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the subject of missions was brought before the Churches, and the beginnings of antislavery agitation were discernible. In 1812 a grudging permission was given to missionaries to land on pagan territory under control of England. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel extended its operations, and the Church Missionary Society, founded in 1812, proceeded on its great career. Reginald Heber, who composed "From Greenland's icy mountains," was consecrated Bishop of Calcutta.

In the second quarter of the century there was a great increase of public spirit on the part of the Anglican clergy. They

The Modern Church

turned to the question of popular education, and, as a result of the societies which were formed largely through their efforts, while in 1818 only one person in England out of seventeen, in 1833 one person out of nine, could read and write. The scheme of education which was perfected in 1871 secured a large majority of the children for the schools of the Anglican Church.

The opposition to Church patronage had early in the century been arraigned and ridiculed by William Cobbett and other agitators. And, truth to say, the absurdities of the Church at the beginning of this century were many. One half of all the rectors did not live near their parishes or pay the slightest attention to them. Four thousand of the churches were unable to support rectors at all. There were populations of a million or more for which the Church made no provision, and the nation came to see the truth of what Lord Henley had said, that it was preposterous for a national Church to exclude such men as Howe, Baxter, Calamy, Doddridge, Lardner, and Hall. With this great increase of energy there was a deep revival of religion, and the formation of Bible and missionary societies

The Modern Church

opened a new era for Christian activity. The census of 1851 opened the eyes of English Churchmen to the unserviceableness of their huge organization. Vigorous measures were passed by Parliament for the regulation of Church property, and reforms on a daring basis were secured in 1834, 1836, 1858, and especially in 1871, when the Irish Church was disestablished (but with a large endowment), and when for the first time the universities were thrown open to Dissenters.

Almost desperate efforts were made to regain the masses. Lord Shaftesbury's scheme in Exeter Hall and the theaters was one of the earliest and best of these methods. Church services were modified, churches were opened on Sunday evenings, hymns were set to popular tunes, bishops preached to cabmen and railroad men, and to artisans in the factory dinner hour. Since 1830 more than \$350,000,000 have been expended in building and restoring churches and in their establishment, while in the same period the missionary societies have doubled their resources.

The advance of biblical learning produced a desire for a revision of the Church Scrip-

The Modern Church

tures. The scheme was planned and developed in the very heart of the Church of England, but when the company was formed for the revision of the Old Testament, besides several Churchmen, one Congregationalist and one Wesleyan minister were invited to join, and at the revision of the New Testament one Baptist, one Wesleyan, one Congregationalist, and one Unitarian.

It was the men of the Evangelical or Low Church who laid the foundations of the Bible and tract and Church missionary societies, and were the most prominent in philanthropic and educational schemes. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, Legh Richmond, who wrote *The Dairyman's Daughter*, William Wilberforce, Zachary Macaulay, father of the historian, H. Melville, R. Cecil, H. Stowell, besides others already mentioned, have been earnest supporters of the part known as Low Church. Millenarian views were taught by many of these, Bickersteth, Cooper, Cummings, and others.

A word about the so-called Tractarian movement. There was a brilliant group of young Englishmen in Oxford University, deeply pious and profoundly troubled by

The Modern Church

questions concerning the position of the Church as a national institution. A longing for a catholicism which was not absolutely Romish upgrew. In 1829 John Henry Newman taught what the Wesleys had taught a hundred years earlier. He collected a small society of collegiates to study Scripture and Church history. In 1833 John Keble, one of the holiest of men, and one of the most talented of hymnists, preached a sermon on "National Apostasy," in which he pointed out the disregard of Church doctrines as a sad sign of the times.

A little meeting of friendly spirits decided on the publication of the *Tracts for the Times*. There were ninety of these issued. Pusey, Froude, Newman, and others whose names suddenly became famous contributed to these books. One taught plainly the doctrine of sacramental grace, the reception of holiness by baptism; another taught the real presence of the body and blood of our Lord in the bread and wine of the communion; another the doctrine of apostolic succession; another that the doctrines of the Church of Rome could be explained in harmony with the Articles of the English Church; still another denounced the Ref-

The Modern Church

ormation; while two were written for the purpose of showing the duty of reserve in communicating religious knowledge, a doctrine which seemed Jesuitic to many. Of this little group Mr. Ward, Mr. Froude, and Mr. Newman all became Romanists, but Keble and Pusey remained firm in their support of the Anglican Church. Keble became immortal by his beautiful verse. Pusey was a still more remarkable man; he sought to carry the Church ideals back to those of the fourth and fifth centuries, when Romish supremacy was not recognized. Many of these clergymen became Romanists; but during his long life Dr. Pusey marched at the head of the High Church movement. "Missions," or what Methodists would call revivals, have been earnestly carried on by the High Church clergy. The advance of the High Church party has been steady, and it has been attended with continuous controversy and conflict in the courts of law, some of the ministers even being imprisoned for resisting the ecclesiastical courts. There is an eager desire, growing into a policy, on the part of the High Church to unite with the Romish and Eastern Churches.

The Modern Church

Meanwhile there has been a third and very different development in the Church—that of the Broad Church. The great intellectual movement of the middle of this century gave impetus to philosophic thought. Coleridge, in his *Age of Reflection*, assailed the old doctrine of word-for-word inspiration of the Bible. Thirlwall, Dr. Arnold, the father of Matthew, and Julius Hare, men of beautiful character and great learning, opened the way for German criticism, contended for the unrestrained discussion of the Holy Scriptures, opposed the High Church movement as a return to skepticism, and deprecated ceremonialism. Then came Frederick Maurice, with a very loose doctrine of inspiration; and Charles Kingsley, who by his books of fiction loosened the theological convictions of thousands; and Frederick W. Robertson, whose sermons have captivated two generations and led many far from the older orthodoxy without knowing that they had even strayed; and John Sterling, who renounced all creeds; and Dean Stanley, who thought that the Church must include all schools of opinion; and Bishop Colenso, who dared to write out his doubts respecting the authenticity of the early narratives of

The Modern Church

Genesis; and Dr. Jowett. Carlyle has had unmeasured influence on speculation; so have such poets as Browning and Lewis Morris; while criticism is represented by T. K. Cheyne, S. R. Driver, Westcott, Lightfoot, and Sanday.

Up to the present the Episcopalians in the United States have not approached in strength and influence the Methodists, Presbyterians, or Baptists; but in some of our larger cities they are doing untold good by their work among the neglected poor.

The Modern Church

IV

Dissenters

EVEN at the close of the eighteenth century the bitterest contempt was held for Dissenters. No one who was not a member of the Church of England could be a member of Parliament or a magistrate. Dissenting ministers were called by Lord Sidmouth "tailors, pig drovers, and chimney sweepers," and Sydney Smith ridiculed Nonconformist missionaries as "consecrated cobblers."

The growth of the United States in population, and the zeal of American representatives of the English "dissenting bodies," have given to Church history a new and most interesting chapter—that which tells of the great work done by Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and other evangelical Churches.

We compile from the elaborated figures presented in Dr. Dorchester's *Christianity in the United States* the following tables of ministers, church organizations, and mem-

The Modern Church

bers of evangelical bodies in the United States at the present. To them we must add: Unitarians, 519 ministers, 445 churches, and 67,749 communicants; and Universalists, 756 ministers, 10,127 church organizations, and 44,863 communicants.

DENOMINATIONS.	Ministers.	Church Organizations.	Communicants or Members.
Adventists.....	1,318	1,938	89,755
Baptists.....	29,790	44,535	3,784,373
Christians.....	1,504	1,731	129,669
Congregationalists.....	5,138	5,236	561,631
Disciples of Christ.....	4,031	7,246	641,053
Dunkards.....	2,461	938	87,000
Evangelicals.....	1,877	2,232	155,000
Friends.....	1,166	859	85,556
Lutherans.....	5,532	9,221	1,338,134
Methodists.....	34,816	55,067	5,405,076
Moravians.....	115	96	12,535
Presbyterians.....	11,489	14,694	1,440,353
Protestant Episcopalians.....	4,323	4,870	580,507
Reformed Episcopalians.....	116	112	10,655
Reformed Churches.....	1,626	2,379	337,882
Salvation Army.....	1,753	631	50,000
United Brethren.....	2,350	4,307	241,638

The Modern Church

V

In the Land of Luther

LUTHER never meant to form a Church, but to reëstablish piety and regain the primitive faith. He was not an organizer like Calvin and Wesley; so that all through the continent there were many divisions of Protestantism, and each state had its own Church. The principal officers of many of these Churches are appointed by the state, and in Germany, Denmark, and Sweden the Lutheran Churches are supported by the public funds. In 1529 the Churches of Saxony had superintendents or bishops for churches. In Sweden bishops were retained, and in Denmark also.

The Lutherans teach the doctrine of baptism, of regeneration, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament—consubstantiation—and that all men are called to salvation. This Church has never emphasized the doctrine of the presence of the Holy Spirit. Many efforts have been made to unite the Lutheran Churches,

The Modern Church

generally by the temporal power. They are now called the Evangelical Union. There are four thousand Lutheran ministers in the United States, and a million communicants. The Jesuits in South Germany have induced multitudes to return to the older faith; the Reformed Churches, the Calvinists, have taken many away in North Germany. "Pietism," which is an effort after holiness of heart, the doctrine that the kingdom of God must be in the human heart, has greatly influenced religious history in Germany. On P. J. Spener's (Strasburg, 1662) "collegia" the class meetings of Methodists were modeled. Spener, Arndt, and others did much to renew the religious life of Germany. But Pietism degenerated into fanaticism and censoriousness. Pietism was itself a descendant of the mysticism of the Middle Ages. But the Pietists never became a separate sect. They furnished the great hymn writers of Germany. Paul Gerhardt, Gerhard Terstee-gen, Bogatzky, and Klopstock, the German Milton, all of them drew inspiration from the Pietists. They influenced Krummacher and Tholuck and Neander and Schleiermacher and Hengstenberg.

The Modern Church

The Unitas Fratrum, formed in Bohemia in the fifteenth century, but persecuted and suppressed and banished, was revived by a young nobleman, Count Zinzendorf, in the eighteenth century. This young nobleman was the godson of Spener. The little religious community which he thus founded or revived is now known as the Moravian community, who have been conspicuous among the earliest and most aggressive missionaries. How powerful was the Moravian influence on John Wesley's spiritual experience we have already seen.

Metaphysical speculation has greatly modified German theology in the last two centuries. Profound questions as to the variations of the sacred text, as to the very nature of inspiration, in their discussion have had a profound, though somewhat indirect, influence on the development of thought in the German churches.

The Modern Church

VI

The Reformed Churches

By the Reformed Churches are usually meant those Churches which were begun on the continent of Europe at the Reformation, but which accept Calvinistic views. The Churches of France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Scotland are by "genesis" Reformed Churches.

The Reformed Churches of France were almost extinguished by the early persecutions. In 1802 a constitution was granted to the few and weak Churches which survived. There are now one hundred consistories. It is a State Church; the State pays six hundred ministers. There is a wonderful evangelistic movement in the Reformed Church of France; also a strong rationalistic and latitudinarian movement.

The Swiss Reformed Churches are largely rationalistic. The population of two millions is equally divided between Protestantism and Romanism. In Holland there are two millions of Reformed Protestants.

The Modern Church

VII

The Eastern Churches

“THE HOLY ORTHODOX CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH” is the Church of eastern Europe and western Asia. It is commonly called the Greek Church, and follows what is known as the Græco-Slavonic rite. It has eighty millions of worshipers, who are divided into twelve patriarchates, of which the chief are Jerusalem, Constantinople, Moscow, and Athens. But Christianity throughout the East has for centuries been fossilized.

The orthodox Churches of the East accept the decisions of the first three councils, but they reject those of later date, and therefore deny the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope of Rome. They allow their lower priests to marry. In 1504 Eastern Christians en masse were excommunicated by Leo IX because of their objection to an item in the Roman creed.

The doctrines of the Eastern Church are more in harmony with Catholicism than

The Modern Church

with Protestantism. Purgatory, transubstantiation, apostolic succession in its strongest phase, the authority of tradition, seven sacraments, the adoration of the Virgin Mary, and the reading of the Scriptures in the language of the ancient Church, all attest an unusual harmony with the doctrines of Romanism.

In Russia the Church has an independent Synod. Peter the Great, drunken and licentious as he was, did much to improve the Church. Greece and Bulgaria each have an independent Synod. By intrigue the Roman Catholics, and by colleges and the circulation of Scriptures the Protestants, have done their best to convert Bulgaria and the adjacent provinces. During the last century the Greek Churches have much improved in learning and thought.

There are in the East also many remnants of ancient Churches: The Church of "Chaldea," whose members are found chiefly in Kurdistan, and which teaches that Christ had but "one nature;" the Jacobites of Syria, who hold a similar doctrine (it is an odd trait of these people that their patriarch always takes the name of Ignatius, who was the first Bishop of An-

The Modern Church

tioch); the Armenians (whom the young student must carefully distinguish from the Arminians of Europe), whose persecution by Mohammedans during 1894, 1895, and 1896 have aroused the indignation of Christendom; the Maronites of Lebanon, who since the twelfth century have been under the control of the pope; the Coptic Church, which descended directly from the ancient Christianity of Egypt (it is interesting to observe that in this Church at communion the apostolic kiss is still given, and ordination is still administered by breathing); and the Abyssinian Church, which circumcises as well as baptizes, and holds the seventh day, as well as the first, to be sacred.

The Eastern Churches, because of their bigotry and backwardness, and because of the monotony of their course during the centuries, are uninteresting to the historian, but they cannot well remain uninteresting long. The future history of religion in eastern Europe and western Asia is with them.

The Stundist movement in Russia should also be mentioned. In the last century German peasants were invited to settle in

The Modern Church

southern Russia. They brought with them their Bibles and Lutheran observances. They were better farmers and better citizens than their Russian neighbors. Their "hours" of service—*stunden* they called them—were so spiritual as to draw in many Russians. Since 1858 they have rapidly multiplied, and now include a quarter of the people in that region. Their one religious authority is the Holy Scriptures. Their literal interpretation of the words of Christ makes them almost socialistic in their views. Of late years they have been subjected to cruel persecution, and have suffered confiscation of property, imprisonment, and banishment to Siberia.

The Modern Church

VIII

The Roman Catholic Church

ONE immediate effect of Protestantism, as we have already seen, was a very considerable reformation in the Roman Catholic Church. Hundreds of reformers, as true in heart as Luther or Wyclif, believed nevertheless that the Catholic Church is "the body of Christ," and that it is sin to leave it. Their efforts to correct abuses were received with much more favor after half of Europe had been swung out of the hands of the pope.

In the sixteenth century a force arose within the Roman Catholic Church which has done more during the last three centuries to strengthen it, to defend it, to extend it, and at the same time to weaken and disintegrate it, than all other forces together—the Society of Jesus, known popularly as "the Jesuits." Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish soldier, wounded severely in 1521, devoted himself thenceforth to holy studies and life. He dedicated himself to the

The Modern Church

blessed Virgin as her knight; made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and on his return laid the foundation of the society in Paris, August 16, 1534. Pope Paul III hesitated long before giving his approval, but the order was confirmed by a bull September 27, 1540. At first the number of members was not to exceed sixty, but this was soon changed. Immediately it provoked opposition. Loyola died July 31, 1556. Francis Xavier, one of the holiest men of all Christendom, and other missionaries, carried the order to the ends of the world. Not even early Christianity nor early Protestantism met with more determined opposition than did the Jesuits. They have been expelled from almost every country in the world; suppressed in France in 1764, 1831, 1845, and 1880; expelled from England in 1579, 1581, 1586, 1602, 1829; expelled from Venice, 1607; from Holland, 1708; from Portugal, 1759 and 1834; from Spain, 1767, 1820, and 1835; abolished by Pope Clement XIV, 1773; restored by Pope Pius VI, 1814; expelled from Belgium, 1818; from Russia, 1820; from Sardinia and Austria, 1848; from Italy, 1860 and 1873; and from Germany, 1872. Only in America

The Modern Church

have they had uninterrupted opportunity to perform their work. But even in countries from which they have been expelled they continue and often prosper. Their zeal is unparalleled; no missionaries have been more fully consecrated than theirs. But they rule or ruin.

The Jansenists of France gave great anxiety to the Church of Rome. They received their name from Bishop Jansen, who introduced the doctrine of predestination (Calvinistic). They freely criticised the doctrine and discipline of the Church, and especially the casuistry of the Jesuits. They advocated public education and the circulation of the Scriptures. They were widely supported in France because of the antagonism of the authority of the pope over the Church of France. Eventually their cause was crushed. Quesnel, their chief representative in literature, was sent into exile and his book condemned. The monastery of Port Royal, which had become famous for its system of education, was suppressed. This was all in the reign of Pope Clement XI, the first pope of the eighteenth century, a man of literature rather than of politics, who, however, being a secular

The Modern Church

prince as well as a priest of God, had to fight against Austria, and took an active part in the Stuart cause in England, encouraging the Pretender in 1715. Another of his troubles was the Jesuit missions in China and the East.

From 1721 to 1724 Innocent XIII was pope, a prudent and good man. Benedict XIII came next, who also had his share of political disputes, and who did much to re-establish peace with the heads of the Church in France. Clement XII became pope in 1730 and spent ten years doing nothing, then died. Benedict XIV became pope in 1740. He was a noble man, learned both in science and art. He exerted himself against the persecutions which had brought misery to Languedoc, adjusted the disputes of Portugal and Sardinia, was severe in his treatment of the Jesuits, and earned the reverence even of the prejudiced Protestants of Germany.

In 1758 Clement XIII came into power. Personally a virtuous man, he was politically an evil force. France, Spain, Naples, and Portugal had suppressed the Jesuits, but he supported them. He came into conflict with Maria Theresa, Archduchess of Bo-

The Modern Church

hemia, and manifested feebleness through all his reign.

The reign of Clement XIV is notable for two things: the suppression of the Jesuits by the pope himself, and the discontinuance of the reading of the papal bull against all heretics. In 1774, two years before our Declaration of Independence was issued, a strong antipapal movement began. Joseph of Austria closed convents and resisted papal authority. Leopold of Tuscany suppressed the Inquisition, and recommended the study of Jansen. Images were destroyed and the devotion to the Sacred Heart was condemned. In 1794 the French Revolution burst upon the earth. The clergy were terribly harassed in France. Rome was declared a republic in 1798. The pope fled over the Alps and died, broken-hearted, in 1799.

For a year no one was elected to the papal chair. Pius VII made his peace with Napoleon, and in 1801 the French troops left Rome. But the whole political and social world was still trembling from the shock and strain of the Revolution. In 1804 the pope went to crown Napoleon in Paris. By 1808 a French army was in

The Modern Church

Rome again; the pope was thrown into prison. He did as dethroned popes usually do, he excommunicated his foes; but Napoleon humiliated him further, and he was taken, still a prisoner, to Fontainebleau. Not till 1813 was the pope permitted to return to Rome, during which time Napoleon had taken pains to render his captivity unbearable. The greatest blunder of Pius VII was his restoration of the Jesuits. He was an ordinary man in extraordinary days; but one virtue was eminently his, that of Christian charity. In his later days he allowed the family of Napoleon to take refuge in Rome, and interceded with England when the great ruffian himself was held prisoner in Saint Helena.

Pius was followed in 1823 by Leo XII, a man with a soul two by two, whose reign is famous for three things: an attack upon Bible societies, an attack upon all who tolerated any difference of opinion from the Church, and support of the Jesuits.

Pius VIII held office for just one year.

Gregory XVI, like Pius VII, saw hard days. He was not wise in his attempts to repress popular agitations in Italy. His best arguments were imprisonments, ban-

The Modern Church

ishments, and executions; and his ideas of Church government became narrower as he advanced in life. But he was a man of personal rectitude and fine taste, greatly encouraged architecture and engineering, patronized literature, founded museums, chose his personal friends among the most scholarly, expended large sums of money on public works, libraries, and sculpture—and at his death left the papacy deeply in debt.

Pius IX, whose papal career was the most notable since the days of the Reformation, was elected in 1846. He was a pronounced Liberal at the time of his election, and tried to administer papal affairs with liberal ideas. He opened the jail doors for the political prisoners whom his predecessors had confined, removed the disabilities of the Jews, and proposed a parliament for the Papal States. Then suddenly came the Revolution of 1848, which touched every part of Europe, and the people of Rome revolted from the pope, murdered his prime minister, and howled about his palace gates. Pius fled, and the republic was declared. In 1849 he was reinstated by the French army, and for twenty years of sorrow and

The Modern Church

strain he was supported in his temporal power by the French. From the day when he left Rome as a fugitive his whole nature and policy changed. He submitted himself thenceforth absolutely to the Jesuits. In 1854 he published the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary. This doctrine had always been held by some in the Church, but was not officially declared till our century. In 1864 he condemned all scientific ideas which appeared to oppose the teachings of the Church. In 1870 he called the great Council of the Vatican which proclaimed the pope infallible. Six hundred bishops from all parts of the world were present, but the dogma had been previously determined upon. Eventually one hundred and six objectors left Rome. "The final vote was taken by acclamation, and the decree was read by the light of candles amid the gloom and awe of a terrific thunderstorm, which would itself have made that day memorable." The very next day Napoleon III declared war against Prussia, and before three months was a prisoner at Sedan. The downfall of Napoleon ended the temporary power of the pope, and Italy became a kingdom. From

The Modern Church

that day the pope has been "the prisoner of the Vatican." The close of the war between Germany and France subjected the Roman Catholic power in Germany to a Protestant government. The overthrow of the projected empire of Maximilian in Mexico was also a severe blow to the friends of the papacy.

The present pope is Leo XIII, a man of high character and ability. His private life is beyond criticism, and his public acts and words have been of such character as would have given him widespread reputation for holiness if he had been a Protestant. While he has no temporal power, he has made himself felt in the politics of almost every nation, arbitrated between Germany and Spain in a serious dispute respecting the Caroline Islands, sent a commissioner to inquire into the disturbances in Ireland and issued a declaration against the famous "Plan of Campaign," was able to modify certain laws which Bismarck had devised to restrain the Jesuits, and has ordered a reconciliation between the clergy and the republic of France. His attitude toward America, and especially his appointment of Satolli to be legate in the United States,

The Modern Church

have done much to offset the attacks which aggressive Protestants constantly make against the growing power of the papacy in this country.

In England, since the time when the political disabilities of Roman Catholics were remitted, the old Church has greatly grown in numbers and influence. There are now two hundred million Roman Catholics in the world.

The Modern Church

IX

A Very Miscellaneous Chapter

WE have already spoken of the early missionary endeavors of Protestantism. In the seventeenth century John Eliot, David Brainerd, and Jonathan Edwards labored for the conversion of the American Indians. The Danish-Halle mission (to India) was begun at the beginning of the eighteenth century. In Greenland and in the West Indies the Moravians labored. The Baptist Missionary Society was founded in 1792 in England, and William Carey sailed for India. The London Missionary Society (made up of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, and Methodists) began in 1795. The Church Missionary Society was fully developed in 1812. Thomas Coke began to preach to the Negro slaves in the West Indies in 1786, and later led Wesleyan missionaries to India. Alexander Duff, a Scotch Presbyterian, went to India in 1829. The Religious Tract Society was founded in 1799. The British and Foreign

The Modern Church

Bible Societies was begun 1804. Adoniram Judson started for Calcutta in 1812, when the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was formed. Then came the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Union in 1814, and later the Presbyterian Board, and the Methodist Episcopal and Lutheran Societies. There are also many aggressive German Missionary Societies. At the beginning of this century most of the heathen world was inaccessible to the Gospel. Now missionaries preach to every tribe and in every tongue.

There are now about \$17,000,000 contributed every year for Protestant foreign missions. There are approximately 17,000 mission stations; about 10,000 missionaries, besides more than 53,000 native laborers; and about 1,500,000 communicants.

The humanitarian labors of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry on behalf of prisoners and the outcast were the direct outgrowth of Christian feeling. By Christian effort criminal law has in all nations been reformed; the sufferings of war have been mitigated; many wrongs of the laboring classes have been relieved; the slave trade, and later slavery, were abolished; the great

The Modern Church

temperance reform has been instituted ; and Churches of various creeds are coming together in a genuine spirit of Christian union. One of the leading characteristics of the modern Church is its love of sacred song ; and the hymns of Christendom are its best statement of theology.

The formation of Sunday schools should be mentioned as one of the notable facts in religious life in the eighteenth century.

Young Men's Christian Associations, the United Societies of Christian Endeavor, the King's Daughters, the Epworth League, and other somewhat similar institutions, attest the solicitude of Evangelical Christianity in the nineteenth century for the young ; while the Salvation Army, institutional churches, and the " forward movement " generally, show its increasing care for the heretofore neglected masses of the great cities.

In 1894 the following statistics were given for Europe : Population, 355,757,426 ; of which 154,568,151 were Roman Catholics, 91,839,789 Greek Catholics, 87,925,139 Protestants, 7,254,257 Jews, 3,553,812 Mohammedans, leaving 10,616,278 not accounted for.

DAK

MAY - 1976

